A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF METROPOLITAN ATLANTA SCHOOL DISTRICTS' ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD SEXUAL HARASSMENT

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF CLARK ATLANTA UNIVERSITY

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

BY

GREGORY SHELDON NASH

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

JULY 1997

R=viii P=178

ABSTRACT

EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

NASH, GREGORY S. B.A. CLARK COLLEGE, 1971
M.M. GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1973
Ed.S. GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY, 1989

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF THE ATTITUDES OF METROPOLITAN ATLANTA SCHOOL DISTRICTS' ADMINISTRATORS AND FACULTY MEMBERS TOWARD SEXUAL HARASSMENT

Advisor: Professor John Blackshear

Dissertation dated July, 1997

The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions of sexual harassment among selected school administrators and faculty members of three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. This study also investigated the relationship between these perceptions toward sexual harassment. A secondary purpose of the study was to add to the body of knowledge about sexual harassment in public schools, using administrators and faculty because these two groups hold the most power in the school and should be more aware of the issue.

Four hundred and seventy questionnaires were distributed to thirty four schools. Questionnaire data were analyzed using the SPSS/PC+ statistical program. Twenty eight null hypotheses relating to the perceptions of administrators and faculty were tested. Descriptive analyses of data, including frequencies, and mean scores, were used to generate data for hypotheses testing.

It was concluded that there were no significant differences in perceptions of administrators and faculty as to sexual harassment in the three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. However, it was found that school level has a significant impact on the perceptions of administrators and faculty as to attitudes about sexual harassment.

NOTICE TO BORROWERS

All dissertations and theses deposited in the Robert W. Woodruff Library must be used only in accordance with the stipulations prescribed by the author in the preceding statement.

The author of this thesis/dissertation is:

Name: Gregory Sheldon Nash

Street Address: 1780 Collines Avenue

City, State and Zip: Atlanta, Georgia 30331

The director of this thesis/dissertation is:

Professor: Dr. John Blackshear

Department: Educational Leadership

School: Education
Clark Atlanta University

Office Telephone: 404 - 344 - 1780

Users of this thesis/dissertation not regularly enrolled as students of the Atlanta University Center are required to attest acceptance of the preceding stipulations by signing below. Libraries borrowing this thesis/dissertation for use of patrons are required to see that each user records here the information requested.

NAME OF USER	ADDRESS	DATE	TYPE OF USE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For their guidance and assistance, I am grateful to the members of my supervisory committee, Dr. John Blackshear, chairman; Dr. Olivia Boggs; and Dr. William Denton.

I am especially grateful to the three Metropolitan Atlanta School Dristicts' administrators and faculty who took time in their very busy schedules to participate in this study.

I would also like to express appreciation to my family, friends, and colleagues for their encouragement and understanding during this period of graduate study.

Finally, I am very grateful to my mother, Bettye Horton Hawthorn, without whose constant love and support the writing of this dissertation would not have been possible.

CONTENTS

TABLES

APPENDIX C

TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Society recognizes academic institutions as settings in which formal education is acquired. Parents entrust their children to educators at an early age and expect their trust to be honored. It is assumed that administrators, faculty, and staff of these institutions will provide a safe working and learning atmosphere for all employees and students (Ross and Marlowe, 1985).

Administrators are charged with keeping schools on track toward achievement of their primary aim which is to educate students. This requires, according to Benezet (1981), a "structure and set of operations by which the organization is led" and "a decision-making apparatus in which various members and constituencies participate with administrators to guide the organization along its way." To function well, the modern school requires administrators who care about the institution and who can work with students and faculty to provide the best possible environment for

learning. The modern school also requires administrators who can manage policies, budgets, programs, and people.

Management of people is, more accurately, managing the conditions which allow them to employ their talents most effectively within the context of their roles at the educational institution. Schools are at the heart of an institutional ideal that is often characterized as a community of learners and seekers of truth where teachers are teaching students; students are engaged in learning and responding to instruction; and staff are committed to their roles in the overall mission of the school. But one confirmed, publicized incident of abuse can cause the school community to fall into chaos and ultimately will affect every aspect of the school and the district.

Sexual harassment is one such abuse. In a school, where mutual respect is a necessary component of success and a fundamental condition for a sense of "community," one might expect to find sanctions against this sort of misbehavior. The nation's attention has been fixed on harassment charges in several recent high-profile situations. Highly publicized cases include the 1991 Clarence Thomas nomination hearings for the Supreme Court, the Navy's 1991 Tailhook convention in Las Vegas, the 1994 investigation of Senator Bob Packwood, and the 1994 sexual harassment suit filed against President Clinton. Clearly, sexual harassment is one of the most prominent issues of the 1990s.

Law suits that deal with the sexual harassment of elementary, middle, and secondary students have steadily increased since 1987 (Sorenson, 1994).

While the pervasiveness of the sexual abuse of children has been chronicled in public hearings, newspapers, litigations, documentaries, and varied forms of literature, public schools as a location of sexual harassment have been studied rarely.

The dilemma of defining sexual harassment often rests in gender based differences in perception (Crawford and Gressley, 1991). These differences are the focus of several studies which find that perception of sexual harassment vary in accordance with the gender of the perceiver, the type of activity, the situational setting, the status of the individuals, the severity of the action, or the placement of the responsibility for the action (Scholzman, 1991).

Perception of harassment is also based upon the age of the perceiver and/or the harasser. Older victims are more likely to consider only explicit acts to be sexual harassment, and as the age of the harasser increases the perceptions of the severity of the action also increase (Baker, Terpstra and Culter, 1990). Additionally, Adams and Johnston (1992) suggest that differences in perception of sexual harassment are the result of the differences of male and female gender role socialization.

School districts, administrators, teachers, and parents must understand how students are sexually harassed, what they can do to protect students, how students can be made aware of what sexual harassment is, what can be done to avoid law suits, and what remedies are available for students and school districts.

Various independent, governmental, and educational research groups have made available documentation that attests to the rise of sexual harassment in the schools. This information on sexual harassment of elementary, middle, and secondary students refers to abuse by school personnel as well as abuse by school peers. Overall, the public has more information about student harassment by school personnel than it has about peer sexual harassment in the schools (Doyle, 1985).

Problems and issues related to sexual harassment have spawned a prodigious amount of media attention and research. However, one rather under-represented area for research is sexual harassment perceptions. Presumably, there are individual differences in how the behavior of one individual towards another may be perceived. What one individual describes as harassment, for example, may be referred to by another as innocent "joking around". Traditionally, sexual harassment sensitivity has been looked at in terms of social-sexual behaviors based on gender. Some research has examined how gender influences perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment (Lee, 1991). However, in previous research, the relationship between personality factors and sexual harassment sensitivity has received only modest attention (Lester, Banta, Barton & Elian 1986).

The traditional view from research is that gender has a significant impact on sex-role behaviors and social-sexual behaviors (Terpstra and Baker, 1989). Likewise, it has become apparent that men and women have

systematically different orientations towards sexually-related behaviors at work (Konrad and Gutek, 1986) resulting in different reactions to sexual harassment (Gutek, Cohen, and Konrad, 1990).

The school and district as a workplace for adults who interact in a variety of roles is often overlooked because of the primary function of education which focuses on students and their needs. Policy which deals with the interrelationships of these adults has often been lacking in school districts. Also, the institutional ideal of the school is often characterized as a "community ... of scholars, learners, seekers of truth" (Hickerson & Johnson, 1992, p. 205), where mutual respect is a fundamental condition of "community" and abuses of power, such as sexual harassment, is anathema to the school's basic mission and responsibility. Therefore, the intent of this study is to determine the attitudes/perceptions of school administrators and faculty members toward sexual harassment.

Purpose of Study

The purpose of this study is to examine the perceptions of sexual harassment among selected school administrators and faculty members of three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD). The study will also investigate the relationship between these perceptions/attitudes toward sexual harassment. A secondary purpose of the study is to add to the body of knowledge about sexual harassment in public schools, using

administrators and faculty because these two groups hold the most power in the school and should be more aware of the issues.

While much research has been conducted on the issue of sexual harassment between faculty and student and student to student, most studies have been made at institutions of higher learning. Research using public school administrators as subjects is not prevalent in the literature. This study may be of value to public schools to prevent potential problems.

Background of Problem

Schools provide settings where many types of interaction take place, most often associated with learning and development. These settings include classrooms, study areas, faculty and administrative offices, rehearsal areas, field study sites, and buses or vans which provide transportation to and from school activities - all are important to the school community and its purposes. The interaction which takes place in these places is among people involved in the educational enterprise. They include the staff and many students who bring different backgrounds and values to the school community. It is a time when human growth and development takes place and when students wrestle with values. The faculty and staff, who have some degree of responsibility in these settings, may represent a myriad of beliefs, dispositions, values, and cultures.

Sexual harassment is a long overlooked but serious problem in our schools. It is not about flirting, humor, raging hormones, or even horseplay.

It is about the need of the offender to exert power over a victim. In 1974, Lin Farley coined the term "sexual harassment" which described the pattern of unwanted sexual attention by males to females in the workplace. Farley identified sexual harassment as a violation of the concept of equality, and the neutrality of the workplace.

For more than a decade , society has gradually come to recognize that women and men should not have to endure sexual harassment in the workplace or in schools. During the early 1990s the televised Supreme Court confirmation proceedings of Clarence Thomas and the well-publicized charges of sexual harassment by elected officials brought the issue of sexual harassment to the attention of the general public.

Sexual harassment is an important problem in the workplace . Not only is it a problem that has an impact on individuals, it is also a problem that can affect organizations both directly and indirectly (Fitzgerald & Schulman, 1993). Sexual harassment is pervasive in all situations in which men and women are required to interact. Academic institutions are not immune (Blum, 1991). Legal costs incurred can be large when sexual harassment is not dealt with effectively. Furthermore, unwanted publicity may accompany sexual harassment charges, having an immeasurable impact on an organization's ability to attract and retain valued employees. Other indirect costs may include lower productivity, lower quality, increased absenteeism, and increased sick leave costs (Gutek & Koss, 1993, Lach & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1993).

Preventing sexual harassment is an important organizational goal for the Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. The obligation to prevent sexual harassment is imposed upon all school building administrators. All administrators have an affirmative obligation to implement strategies that will prevent sexual harassment from occurring in our school systems. As an essential component of this responsibility, administrators have an additional obligation to avoid and prevent conduct that might be perceived as sexual harassment and to encourage other employees to do the same. All employees are urged to be sensitive to their own behavior and to how it is perceived by others. Whether certain behavior constitutes sexual harassment often depends on the perceptions of those affected.

When violations of the system's sexual harassment policies occur, appropriate disciplinary action, ranging from a warning to dismissal /expulsion will be considered and initiated, as appropriate. No reprisal or retaliation will be taken against individuals who file sexual harassment complaints or against individuals who participate in the investigation of such complaints.

The health and vitality of a school are dependent upon maintaining a climate in which faculty, administrators and students feel comfortable. The absence of comfort is not conducive to a positive learning environment. Because sexual harassment is an issue which can negatively affect climate, it is important to determine the perceptions held by constituents regarding this

issue. Further, it is important to determine the extent to which varying parties have compatible perceptions.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is to determine if selected school administrators and faculty members in three Metropolitan Atlanta Districts differ in their perception of sexual harassment as related to age, gender, marital status, experience, race and knowledge of sexual harassment policy.

Significance of the Study

Although many administrators and faculty members recognize their legal and moral obligation to alleviate sexual harassment in the school community, the number of reported sexual harassment cases continues to increase. Schools must be committed to examine policies and procedures, provide better educational opportunities, and become more responsive to sexual harassment issues. Each member of the academic community must be encouraged to use ethical behavior and to take responsibility for behaviors exhibited. This is most important as sexual harassment can be costly for any district, as well as for the individual. School administrators should be aware of the consensus concerning the definition, the variability of research regarding the extent of the problem, and the issue's social complexity.

Administrators and staff are in a posture of having to determine what is or is not a legal case according to their perception of sexual harassment. Their perception will impact the reporting and/or filing charges for and against the parties involved. This study should provide insight into sexual harassment in public school and the perceptions of faculty and administrators regarding the seriousness of this issue.

Research Questions

1. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
2. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
3. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
4. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty members regarding sexual

harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

5. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
6. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
7. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
8. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
9. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

10. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
11. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
12. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
13. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
14. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
15. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding

sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

16. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
17. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
18. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
19. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
20. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

21. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
22. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
23. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
24. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
25. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experience regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?
26. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experience

regarding sexual harassment experiences in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

27. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experience regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

28. Are there significant differences in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experience regarding sexual harassment in three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts (MASD)?

Summary of Introduction

Schools, like most institutions, are traditional, stable, and slow to change. However, society is very fluid and constantly changing. Consequently, many school administrators and faculty members do not recognize that the rules for appropriate behavior have changed. Because they often do not understand the seriousness of sexual harassment, they have done little to combat it. Many administrators do not know what sexual harassment is and do not recognize their responsibility to stop it.

Academic institutions face the possibility of increased student awareness of sexual harassment and legal liabilities associated with sexual harassment law suits. Previous research indicates that women are the

primary victims of sexual harassment and that men and women do not perceive the same behaviors as harassment. The differences in perception in other research are based on several variables such as the gender of the perceiver, the environmental setting, the type of activity, the status of the individuals involved, the age of the perceiver and the degree of severity of the action. This study examines demographic variables such as gender, age, employment, and marital status as indicators of gender role attitudes which are predicted to influence the perceptions of sexual harassment. This study also examines the perception of the impact of sexual harassment on school climate.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

History and Definition of Sexual Harassment

The phrase "sexual harassment" became part of the English language in 1974 as activists and authors began giving attention to the problem. In the 1960s and 1970s women began talking among themselves about the shared experience of unwanted sexual overtures. In 1974 Lin Farley coined the term sexual harassment to describe the pattern of unwanted sexual attention by males to females in the workplace. Farley identified sexual harassment as a violation of the concept of equality, and the neutrality of the workplace. She was the first to address the psychological, sociological, ideological, ethical, legal, and economic consequences of sexual harassment (Farley, 1978).

Prior to the 1970s, unwanted sexual attention, the core component of sexual harassment, was not conceptualized as a potentially harmful form of behavior. Since that time, sexual harassment has been called "a social problem of almost staggering proportions" (Fitzgerald, 1993, p. 2). By the

early 1980s, sexual harassment was viewed as a serious social problem that was deserving of research attention.

There is no single definition that can encompass all perspectives created by the unique ways in which different individuals experience sexual harassment, and satisfy the purposes for which we need and use definitions. While sexual harassment is not amenable to a precise or compact definition, the basic concept of sexual harassment is not difficult to describe or understand.

Sexual harassment is a violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Acts of 1964, the 1991 amendment regarding employees of academic institutions, and Title IX of the Educational Amendments Act of 1972 pertaining to students. This issue is defined by the courts in the case of *Alexander v. Yale University* (1977) as a form of sex discrimination that denies equal access to educational opportunities.

In April 1989, Robert H. Atwell, President of the American Council on Education, issued the Council's Statement of Sexual Harassment to its members. The statement indicates that

> Sexual harassment can be verbal, visual, or physical. It can be overt, as in the suggestion that a person could get an "A" if a particular sexual favor is granted. Or, it can consist of persistent, unwanted attempts to change a professional relationship to a personal one.

> Sexual harassment can range from inappropriate put downs of individual persons or classes of people, unwelcome sexual flirtations to serious physical abuses such as rape. It is coercive and threatening; it creates an atmosphere that is not conducive to teaching, learning, and working (p. 200)

In her narrative on legal developments, Coles (1986) provides the legal definition of sexual harassment, formulated by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC, 1980), and adopted by the United States Supreme Court in the *Meritor savings Bank, FSB v. Vinson* (1986) decision:

> Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature... when (1) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment, (2) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual, or (3) such conduct has the purpose or effect of unreasonably in interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment. (p. 268)

Coles adds that, "Sexual harassment now includes not only harassment in which a supervisor demands sexual consideration in exchange for job benefits, but also harassment that creates an offensive environment for the employees. (p. 267)

In the legal definition of sexual harassment (EEOC, 1980), two types of behaviors are prohibited: a) *quid pro quo* harassment, which is a sexual proposition tied to either a direct threat (such as job loss or demotion) or a direct offer (such as increased pay or promotion); and b) any behavior of a sexual nature that interferes with a person's work or created a *hostile* or *offensive work environment.*

Even people who know the legal definition of sexual harassment do not always agree as to whether a particular act constitutes sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985; Sandroff, 1992). Sharon Howard (1991) provides a common, working definition of sexual harassment and distinguishes between *quid pro quo* and *hostile environment* harassment. The article suggests that the development of a written policy and consistent accessible grievance procedures are the fundamental resources for addressing sexual harassment in an organization. The widespread dissemination of the policies and procedures together with the training of individuals likely to receive complaints is just as basic. Most importantly, a truly effective program for the prevention and remedy of sexual harassment will be tied to larger efforts

to improve the climate and to achieve equity for women within the organization or institution.

Lee and Heppner (1991) discuss the difficulty in defining and measuring sexual harassment and define sexual harassment in categories of behavior: materials (letters, notes, objects), body language (gestures, ogling, standing too close, leering), verbalizations (suggestive or offensive comments or jokes), physical advances, and blackmail (threats or rewards to gain compliance). Bogart and Stein (1987) define a range of behaviors including sexual humor, innuendoes, physical threats, and sexual assaults.

Sexual harassment covers a wide range of improper, unwelcome sexual or sex-based behaviors which can occur in many settings. The behaviors may be verbal or non-verbal. They may be overt or subtle. According to Gruder (1992), sexually harassing behaviors range from verbal requests and verbal comments to nonverbal displays. Verbal requests consist of any statements or actions used in an attempt to reach a desired sexual goal (e.g., sexual bribery, sexual advances, or subtle pressures). Verbal comments are usually not made in order to obtain a sexual or social relationship but may be made in order to demean the victim (e.g., personal sexual remarks, sexual remarks about co-workers, general sexual remarks). Nonverbal displays encompass sexual assault, sexual touching, sexual gesturing, and the presentation of sexual material.

Guidelines established that the key to determining whether or not sexual conduct was illegal was whether it was unwelcome. Sexual

harassment is defined by the victim: if an individual finds the comments or physical contact to be unwelcome, then it is harassment, and sexual harassment is a continuum of unwanted behaviors ranging from spoken or written comments and stares to actual physical assault and attempted rape (Marczel, 1993).

Sexual harassment has been defined by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) has amended the EEOC definition to address issues particular to educational environments.

Most educational researchers base their definition of sexual harassment on the one set forth in the 1980 Equal Employment Opportunity Commission guidelines or Title IX of the 1972 Education Amendments:

> Harassment on the basis of sex is a violation of section 703 of Title VII. Unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment; submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting the individual; or such conduct has the purpose of effect of unreasonably interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment.

> Sexual harassment consists of verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature, imposed on the basis of sex, by an employee or agent of a recipient that denies, limits, provides different, or conditions the provision of aid, benefits, services or treatment protected under Title IX.

Both definitions provide educational researchers considerable freedom when defining sexual harassment. Established by each researcher's definition, the problem could be minor or pandemic.

Allegations of sexual harassment are evaluated on a case by case basis from the totality of the circumstances. Generally, a single action will not constitute sexual harassment. The EEOC and the courts have found, however, that a single sex-based incident that is quite severe may constitute sexual harassment.

Law and/or Policy of Sexual Harassment

As public awareness of sexual harassment grew, the law evolved as well. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, religion, or national origin. In 1980 the EEOC, the agency responsible for implementing Title VII, issued guidelines that established criteria for determining what forms of conduct constitute sexual harassment.

Both the courts and the Office of Civil Rights (OCR) of the U.S. Department of Education recognized two forms of unlawful sexual harassment: 1) *quid pro quo* cases, where a person's entitlement to enjoyment of a particular benefit (such as educational opportunity) is conditioned on sexual favors; and 2) *hostile environment* cases, where unwelcome conduct has the purpose of effect of unreasonably interfering with a person's right or benefit (such as education) by creating an intimidating, hostile, offensive environment. In school settings, particularly between students, allegations typically concern the *hostile environment* claim (Nashoba, 1993).

To find that a *hostile environment* exists, OCR must find that the alleged victim was subjected to verbal or physical conduct imposed because of the victim's gender, that the conduct was unwelcome, and that the conduct was sufficiently severe, persistent or pervasive as to alter the conditions of the victim's education and create an abusive environment. In cases of student-to-student harassment, an educational institution will be liable for *hostile environment* sexual harassment where an official of the institution knew, or reasonably should have known, of the harassment's occurrence and the institution failed to take appropriate steps to halt the conduct (Nashoba, 1993).

Bogart and Stein (1987) provide a social overview by presenting patterns of sexual harassment in education, the underlying dynamics of

sexual harassment, and strategies for addressing sexual harassment. Riger (1991) explores the reasons few women use established sexual harassment grievance procedures. Hazzard (1989) documents that sexual harassment is becoming a serious issue among men and that the number of men alleging sexual harassment is increasing.

The legal basis for sexual harassment court cases is Section 703 of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended (Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1980). These guidelines address the definition of harassment, conduct that constitutes harassment, and employer responsibility. Klein, Wilber, and Stein (1986) and Wetherfield (1990) examine court cases that involve sexual harassment and Title VII and Title IX issues. Both articles survey federal laws prohibiting sexual harassment and address the educational institution's responsibility for implementing Title VII guidelines.

The statute states that it is unlawful for an employer to discriminate against an individual with respect to terms, conditions or privileges of employment, because of a person's sex. From the late 1970s, federal district courts and the United States Courts of Appeal have ruled that sexual harassment was a form of sexual discrimination prohibited under Title VII. The United States Supreme Court confirmed this interpretation in *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson*, 477 U. S. 57 (1986).

Even people who know the legal definition of sexual harassment do not always agree as to whether a particular act constitutes sexual harassment (Gutek, 1985, Sandroff, 1992). In 1992, the Supreme Court reinforced the school system's responsibility to ensure that each student can attend school in a safe environment, and allowed sexual harassment lawsuits to be filed under Title IX of the Education Act of 1972 (Adler & Rosenberg, 1992).

Title VII does not specifically refer to schools, it prohibits discrimination only in the workplace. Title VII is still relevant for educators because the courts have been accepting these EEOC guidelines as the legal definition of sexual harassment everywhere. In the eyes of the law, administrators, teachers, and other supervisory school personnel are equated with employers in that their positions give them the kind of control that creates the opportunity for harassment and the responsibility for redressing it (Marczel, 1993).

The first case that established a constitutional duty of school districts to protect students from sexual harassment was *Stoneking v. Bradford Area School district* (1988). In this federal appeals case, a high school student had been repeatedly sexually abused by one of her teachers. The Third Circuit Court ruled since schools are in a custodial relationship with students because of mandatory attendance laws, the school district owes a duty of care to the students to protect them from harm. Stoneking was significant because this was the first time a federal court had ruled that a school district had a constitutional duty to take care of and to protect students. The legal

theory of law was based upon the liberty right of bodily freedom found in the due process clause and equal protection of the Fourteenth Amendment. However, the Stoneking decision was reversed the following year in light of the Supreme court decision in *De Shaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services* (1989).

In the De Shaney case, the Supreme Court ruled that county social workers and officials had no Fourteenth Amendment duty to protect a child from physical abuse by his father. According to the Supreme Court, the Constitution does not guarantee a citizen protection from private harm from a third party. If someone is in a custodial relationship with the state so that the state must take care of that individual (prisoner, mental patient, or ward of the state), then a public duty is owed to the individual if the state does not protect the individual from harm or renders the individual incapable of taking care of himself or herself. This precedent then became applicable to public school students. The Supreme Court did not want to equate students with mental patients or prisoners because they felt that the students could take care of themselves, leave the school, choose another school, and turn to their families for assistance. This decision was a bitter defeat for elementary, middle, and high school students who could have turned to this legal remedy to support their cause of action for sexual harassment cases. Stoneking did open an avenue for potential school district and personnel liability and other circuit courts may still decide to use this constitutional duty theory for students. In this decision, the Supreme Court added that a

school district and educators could be held liable if school personnel acted with "deliberate indifference" to a sexual harassment complaint.

"Deliberate indifference" liability standard was reaffirmed in *Jane Doe v. Taylor Independent School District* (1992). A secondary student had been sexually molested by her coach-teacher. The Fifth Circuit stated that since the student was compelled to attend school, the school owed her an affirmative duty of protection. This decision also led to a reversal of the ruling that school officials have an affirmative constitutional duty to protect students. The Circuit Court ruled that if school personnel acted with "deliberate indifference" or with "malicious intent" in regard to sexual harassment, then they would be liable to the student. In the Jane Doe case, the student and her family asserted a Title 42, Section 1983 of the 1871 Civil Rights Act claim. In relation to this statute, a school district is a governmental body of the state that carries out the policies of the state. If a student is injured during the execution of a policy, then the school district or school board may be liable for the harm (42 U.S.C. Sec. 1983). Section 1983 is a federal civil rights claim which means that the student and her family could sue individual teachers and administrators along with the school district. Although the Stoneking and Jane Doe cases were unsuccessful attempts by students plaintiffs to support their cause of action for sexual harassment, both also pointed to the legal remedies of "deliberate indifference," "malicious intent," and Title 42, Section 1983 of the 1871 Civil Rights Act. In addition, these cases showed how school personnel can

contribute to the dynamics of sexual harassment by ignoring the problem or wanting to hide sexual harassment from public scrutiny.

The New York Supreme Court ruled that a teacher, school district, and school board were liable for the sexual assault of an elementary student by two older students in the school. The teacher had insisted that the student use a hallway lavatory instead of one located in the classroom. The older assaulting students had a record of misconduct so the administration was aware of their behavior patterns (*Shante D. v. City of New York Board. of Education Local School No. 5,* 1993). Here the standard of liability was negligence--i.e., that the harm was foreseeable and that the district knew or should have known of the sexual harassment. The essential elements of negligence include:

a) the existence of a legal duty to protect others from unreasonable risk of injury,

b) the breach of the duty,

c) the breach is the cause of the injury, and

d) the plaintiff must suffer damages (La Morte, 1987).

Both state and federal courts have acknowledged the following legal remedies to support students' cause of action for sexual harassment:

1.) Title 42 of the United States Code, Section 1983 of the 1871 Civil Rights Act. The Fourteenth Amendment grants individuals protection from due process violations of life, liberty, and property rights. In the case of sexual

harassment cases, the student would seek damages against individuals of school districts for a violation of his or her liberty right to bodily security.

2.) Negligence has been a basis for a cause of action in various types of educational tort (non-criminal) cases. A school district owes a legal duty of care to protect the student from an unreasonable risk of harm. If that duty is breached by school personnel and an injury occurs because of the breach, then the school district or personnel will be liable. Foreseeability is an important issue in negligence cases. For example, if a teacher witnessed the sexual harassment of a student and failed to report it to the principal, the school district would be liable because it was foreseeable that the harassment could happen again, but nothing was done about it. Not only are a student's civil rights affected in a sexual harassment incident, but their emotional health and psychological well-being are also affected.

3.) A student has a cause of action for sexual harassment based on Title IX legislation. If a student suffers sexual harassment at a school that receives federal financial assistance, then the school is mandated by legislation to

assure that sexual discrimination does not occur on campus.

4.) School districts may also be vicariously liable for the sexual harassment committed by one of its employees - respondeat superior (Bittner, 1996).

Many organizations have established policies and procedures to deal with sexual harassment, yet few complaints are reported. Some have suggested that the lack of complaints is due to the absence of a problem, or the timidity or fearfulness of victims. Riger (1991) proposes that the reasons for the lack of use of sexual harassment grievance procedures lie not in the victims, but rather in the procedures themselves. Women perceive sexual harassment differently than men do, and their orientation to dispute-resolution and the nature of dispute-resolution procedures may better fit male than female perspectives. This gender bias is likely to discourage women from reporting complaints.

If school districts become aware of how sexual harassment cases are handled in the courtroom, they can become aware of sexual harassment by school personnel and peers. Administrators, teachers, and parents can learn about various kinds of harassment, can learn about overt and covert forms of harassment, and can learn about warning signals or indicators of sexual harassment. School personnel can also learn about the circumstances and context of the harassment. By becoming familiar with the status of sexual harassment cases in the courts, school personnel can examine their official

school policies on sexual harassment to make sure that the policy effectively deals with harassment issues and is current with changes or modifications in the related law. By learning about student successes and setbacks in the courtroom, educators, parents, and community members can develop a knowledge base for sexual harassment training sessions and workshops.

Sexual Harassment in Public Schools

The majority of research on sexual harassment of students has been done in the post secondary environment. Assessing sexual harassment of students by teachers at the secondary level is complicated by the fact that harassing behaviors involving touching are classified as "child abuse", while verbal forms are labeled sex discrimination. The first survey on peer to peer sexual harassment in secondary schools was conducted by the Massachusetts Department of Education in 1980-81 (Bogart and Stein, 1987). This study indicated that sexual harassment is a problem for students in high schools; that student to student harassment is more common than teacher to student harassment; that females are more likely to be victims of the more severe forms of unwanted sexual attention. Propositions accompanied by obscene comments were a recurring problem.

A further study in secondary schools of teacher-student sexual harassment revealed a discrepancy between the number of incidents of sexual harassment reported by superintendents and the number of incidents reported by students (Wishnietsky, 1991). Whereas 148 student

respondents reported 90 incidents of sexual harassment during their high school years, superintendents indicated only 26 incidents of a teacher's being disciplined for sexual harassment over a similar time period. Although data from this study do not demonstrate that sexual harassment is rampant in secondary schools, students' report of experiences with sexual harassment indicated there is sexual harassment of students by teachers at the secondary level.

Student to student sexual harassment is a form of sexual harassment unique to the educational environment. A survey of public school students grade eight through eleven by the American Association of University Women released in June, 1993 reported that sexual harassment is a common experience to the majority of 8th to 11th grade students in America's public schools. According to the findings of this survey, 81% reported that they have been the target of some form of sexual harassment. Additional findings included the following: there are notable gender and racial/ethnic gaps; sexual comments, jokes, looks, and gestures as well as touching, grabbing, and/or pinching in a sexual way, are commonplace in school. Higher numbers of girls than boys say they had suffered as a result of sexual harassment in school; African American girls had suffered the most. The study evidences early support of the societal notion that "boys will be boys, as one 14-year old white male is quoted as saying: "I don't care. People do this stuff every day. No one feels insulted by it. That's stupid. We just play around. I think sexual harassment is normal." However, there is nothing

normal or funny about sexual harassment, as reflected in the comment of a 14-year old African American female: "It made me feel low. Thought that I was dirt. I just wanted to die" (p. 25).

In *Doe v. Petaluma City School District* (1993), a federal court ruled that money damages were available to a middle school student who had experienced peer harassment at school. If the student could prove that the school intentionally discriminated on the basis of sex, then the school district's liability would be based upon violation of Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (P. L. 92-318). Sexual harassment is a form of sexual discrimination and would therefore be prohibited by Title IX which forbids exclusion from participation in or the benefit of any education program that receives federal financial assistance (20 U. S. C. sex. 1681).

"Jane Doe" had sued her counselor under Section 1983 because he had concluded that her sexual harassment was not important. In May 1995, the Ninth Circuit Court ruled that the counselor was not liable for failing to protect "Jane Doe" from harassment. This means that school employees are given immunity from a sexual harassment suit if their decisions were made in good faith (Court Dismisses Student Suit, 1995). Since Title IX applies to harassment committed by the recipient of federal financial assistance, the court dismissed the complaint because it was difficult to apply liability to a school if a peer (non-recipient) had perpetrated the harassment. The court did leave open the possibility of school personnel liability for sexual harassment if they failed to take action in the case of peer sexual harassment.

The precedent for this Title IX cause of action was established in the 1992 Supreme Court ruling in *Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools.* The Supreme Court ruled that a high school student could receive money damages from her school district under Title IX for having been subjected to sexual harassment by a teacher, as a recipient of financial assistance, the district was liable for sex discrimination. It was also suggested by the Supreme Court in this case that the school board could be held liable for sexual harassment of a student despite a lack of knowledge of the event. This concept of vicarious liability is based on the legal theory of respondent superior that makes employers liable for the acts of their employees (Reutter, 1994).

While much is known about sexual harassment in the workplace, very little is known about sexual harassment in schools. Not unlike their adult counterparts in the workplace, children in school report that they are experiencing unwanted advances. Students, however, are required by law to remain in school and thus have the right to be safe there (AAUW, 1993 pp. 2-3).

The school and district as workplaces for adults who interact in a variety of roles are often overlooked because of the primary function of education which focuses on students and their needs. Policy which deals with the interrelationships of these adults has often been lacking in school districts. Also, the institutional ideal of the school is often characterized as a community where mutual respect is a fundamental condition and abuse of

power, such as sexual harassment, is anathema to the school's basic mission and responsibility (Hickerson and Johnson, 1992, p. 205).

The first major study of sexual harassment directed toward children in a school setting was published in 1993, commissioned by the American association of University Women (AAUW). The AAUW's study (Hostile hallways, 1993) focused mainly on verbal comments and nonverbal displays, since verbal requests most often involve the perpetrator's power over the victim. The study's results indicated that sexual harassment perpetrated by one student to another was very widespread among children and adolescents in American schools. Slightly more than 80% of the surveyed students between the Grades 8 and 11 experienced sexual harassment sometime during their school years. More girls than boys experienced sexual harassment, but the percentage of boys who experienced sexual harassment was also high (i.e., 85% of girls; 76% of boys). The top three types of sexual harassment were: 1) sexual comments, jokes, gestures, or looks; 2) touching, grabbing, or sexual pinching; and 3) intentionally brushing up against a person in a sexual way. Adults were identified as perpetrators of 19% of the harassment experienced, whereas peer harassment was much more common (81%).

The AAUW survey (Hostile hallways, 1993) found, as have other studies (e.g., Reilly it al., 1986) that sexual harassment in an educational setting has a detrimental effect on the victims education. Sexually harassed victims reported that after experiencing sexual harassment they found it

difficult to study (16%), difficult to concentrate in class (28%). In addition, sexually harassed students reported making lower grades (16%), not wanting to attend school, and having thoughts about changing schools. In addition, victims reported embarrassment, fear, self-consciousness, and other emotional problems caused by sexual harassment. The sexual harassment also had a behavioral impact on students, including the avoidance of perpetrators and the environment in which the sexual harassment occurred (hallways, sport activities, etc.). Overall, it was found that student to student sexual harassment was more prevalent and detrimental than previously thought.

Recent studies have documented that sexual harassment is rampant in our schools. Behavior that was once seen as normal or tolerated as merely rude may now result in educators losing their jobs and or damaging their careers. Many experienced administrators and teachers admit that they do not know what they should do if they see student-to-student sexual harassment or are victims of harassment themselves.

Nan Stein (1995) argues that sexual harassment in schools is a form of gender violence that often happens in the public arena. She presents narratives of girls and boys about their experience of sexual harassment in schools and parallels are found with cases documented in court records and depositions. While highly publicized lawsuits and civil rights cases may have increased public awareness of the issue, inconsistent findings have sent educators mixed messages about ways of dealing with peer-to-peer sexual

harassment. The antecedents of harassment are found in teasing and bullying, behaviors tacitly accepted by parents and teachers. Deliberate adult intervention and the inclusion of a curriculum in schools that builds awareness of these issues are advocated by Stein.

McKinney (1990) investigated the sexual harassment of university faculty by colleagues and students. Using a mailed questionnaire, McKinney obtained faculty definitions of sexual harassment, the attitudes of faculty, and actions taken. Results suggested few differences in attitudes and experience. Male and female faculty did not differ in definitions of sexual harassment; however, "women faculty usually have more negative attitudes toward and broader definitions of sexual harassment than do male faculty" (p. 421). The study further noted that incidents of harassment were usually not reported, but when they were, it was most often done by the female.

Underwood (1987) warns secondary educators of their obligations and liabilities regarding sexual harassment. Schools and school boards can be found liable when the district takes no action on an allegation of harassment.

In *Ingraham v. Wright,* 430 U. S. 651, 674 (1977), the United States Supreme Court mandated that schools provide a safe environment for students. Separate from legal precedent, school faculty and administrators claim that students are of primary importance and that all students should be treated fairly and justly. Based on court cases and the educational mission,

educators have a legal and ethical responsibility to protect students from sexual harassment.

Although the majority of research about sexual harassment in an academic setting has been performed on college campuses, the problem has been experienced at all grade levels. Wishnietsky (1991) presents a descriptive study that reports the scope of sexual harassment between high school students and teachers from an administrative and student perspective. He also suggests procedures for recognizing and ending improper relationships.

Recent research describes the development and implementation of an educational program on sexual harassment that was presented to all 7th - and 8th - grade students at a public middle school. A follow-up survey indicated increased reports of sexual harassment after the educational program by both girls and boys. A possible explanation is that after the educational program, students were better informed about what constitutes sexual harassment and were more able to accurately identify what they were experiencing. Eighty six percent (86%) of the girls and seventy three percent (73 %) of the boys indicated that the educational program was of value (Roscoe, Strouse, Goodwin, et al., 1994).

Stringer, Remick, Salisbury, and Ginorio (1990) examine the power and reasons behind various forms of sexual harassment in the workplace. Since an educational setting is a workplace, this article certainly applies to the academic environment. They cite seven specific reasons sexual

harassment occurs in the workplace and suggest effective responses to each type of harassment.

Hickerson and Johnson (1992) presented solutions from the administrative perspective. Their article describes the process of policy development and dissemination, codes of conduct, and responses to the formal and informal curriculums.

The antecedents of peer sexual harassment in schools may be found in "bullying"--behaviors children learn, practice, and experience beginning at a very young age. Children know what a bully is, and many boys as well as girls have been victims of bullying. Much of the bullying that takes place at this age is between members of the same sex (Kutner, 1993). Teachers and parents know about bullying, and many accept it as an unfortunate stage that some children go through on their way to adolescence and adulthood.

Results from three recent national surveys on sexual harassment in schools illustrate its persistent and public nature, and demonstrate that it is a widespread phenomenon. The first survey, developed by the Wellesley College Center for Research on Women and cosponsored by the National Organization for Women's (NOW) Legal Defense and Education Fund, was published in the September 1992 issue of *Seventeen* magazine (LeBlanc, 1992). The results were compiled from a nonscientific, random sample of 2,000 girls aged nine to nineteen. In two-thirds of the reports of incidents of sexual harassment in the *Seventeen* study, the girls reported that other people were present during the harassment. The most frequently cited location of

witnessed incidents was the classroom: 94 percent of the girls who indicated that others were present when harassment occurred reported that it occurred in the classroom; 76 percent of those who reported that other people were present during the harassment cited the hallway, and 69 percent cited the parking lot or the playing fields. Four important findings emerged from this survey: 1) sexual harassment is pervasive in secondary schools (89 percent); 2) students consider sexual harassment a serious problem (70 percent); 3) the behavior occurs in public places (67 percent); and 4) students have difficulty getting help, even though a majority reported trying to talk to someone about the harassing behavior.

A study of sexual harassment in the Connecticut public schools during the 1993-1994 school year revealed that 78 percent of a random sample of high school students in grades ten through twelve reported experiencing at least one incident of sexual harassment in high school. The researchers found that girls were twice as likely to report experiencing the problem as boys: 92 percent of the female students and 57 percent of the male students reported that they had been the targets of unwelcome sexual conduct since they started high school (Permanent Commission, 1995).

It is a mistake to ignore homosexual harassment because a large amount of the total sexual harassment is done by men to men. Effeminate men or young boys who are 'different' in some other way are often exposed to harassment and teasing much more vicious than that done to a woman. In addition to outrageous verbal abuse and pranks ("faggot" scrawled on their

lockers, mayonnaise smeared on their seats, anal sexual motions made every time they walk by) these young boys often face assault, sabotage, and extraordinary levels of isolation. If the man complains, he will be sent for counseling (Clay, 1993).

Stein, Marshall, and Tropp (1993), described the harm that unaddressed sexual harassment causes in schools:

> Problems in schools fester, spawning an atmosphere that permits and tolerates, at a minimum, sexual harassment and discrimination, denying students the right to an equal educational opportunity and equal protection under the law. Other more cynical lessons also are taught by such behaviors: schools become unsafe places and students lose confidence in school policies and trust for school officials. These consequences are felt not only by victims and subjects, but also by bystanders, whether they are innocent witnesses or deliberate colluders. (p. 18).

There is a dearth of research on sexual harassment of any type in the public school system in America. Wishnietsky (1991) reported that administrators were reluctant to be associated with a questionnaire about improper teacher to student relationships. When questioned as to why, administrators said they were apprehensive about what facts would be discovered. A careful search of the Educational Resources Information

Center (ERIC) has revealed little on sexual harassment in the public schools as a workplace.

Perceptions of Sexual Harassment

Terpstra and Baker (1987) demonstrated empirically that people do not agree on which behaviors constitute harassment. The more severe an act is perceived to be, the more likely it is to be labeled sexual harassment (Baker, Terpstra, & Larntz, 1990).

Some may argue that basic differences between men and women in personal orientation to sexual behavior explain the difference between men and women in attitudes toward sexual harassment. Personal orientation toward sexual behavior is conceptualized as an individual's personal response to sexual incidents, or how the individual him- or herself generally feels when a sexual overture is made. Men and women may systematically differ in personal orientation toward sexual behavior. This gender difference may be partially due to social norms that prescribe a double standard for men and women in heterosexual relationships (Tavris and Offir, 1977).

Men are encouraged to desire and pursue sexual relationships with many women, and men who are successful in so doing are often admired by other men (Tavris and Offir, 1977, p. 63). Because men generally initiate sexual overtures, they may be flattered when women make sexual overtures.

In contrast, women are discouraged from engaging in sexual relationships with many men, and women who do so are often derided by

other women as well as by men (Martin, 1972; Tavris and Offir, 1977). Women may initiate fewer sexual overtures than men because of this normative pressure. Since men usually initiate overtures toward them rather than the reverse, women may not consider themselves responsible for sexual incidents they have experienced. Since sexual overtures from men are not uncommon, women may not be particularly flattered when men make sexual overtures.

Administrators need to better understand sexual harassment. The issue is an unresolved and complex social problem that involves behaviors that range from suggestive looks to sexual assault. One of the problems of defining sexual harassment is that behavior that is intimidating and offensive to some may be harmless and even welcomed by others. Bogart and Stein (1987) examine the range of behaviors described as sexual harassment by girls in secondary schools. They explore the underlying dynamics of the harassment and discuss legal and other strategies for preventing and addressing sexual harassment.

Men and women may experience sexual harassment differently. These perceptual differences may cause men and women to define sexual harassment differently and to have diverse opinions concerning what is offensive behavior. Riger (1991) examines gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures caused by these gender differences and suggests ways to resolve them.

As the initiators in sexual relationships, men may see the workplace as a potential arena for sexual conquest. As the receivers in sexual relationships, women may view sexual overtures occurring at the workplace as potential threats of exploitation (Gutek and Dunwoody, 1986). Women's perceptions of sexual overtures at work as threatening may be rooted in experience. While sexual liaisons with coworkers have been found to enhance a man's status in the work organization, such liaisons have been found to degrade a woman's status (Farley, 1978). It may be expected that men will have a more positive orientation toward sexual behavior at work than women and that, due to their more positive orientation, men will be less likely to label sexual behavior at work sexual harassment.

Individuals disagree considerably as to whether some behaviors constitute sexual harassment. In part, this may stem from the fact that whether a certain action or behavior is sexual harassment depends not only on the intent behind the action or behavior but also on the perceptions of these affected. When sexually harassing behavior is pervasive, these kinds of activities--the sexual jokes, the insulting sexual remarks or gestures--may contribute to a *hostile environment* in the workplace. The EEOC guidelines on sexual harassment (1980) make it clear that a hostile work environment resulting from sexual harassment is unlawful and this interpretation has been upheld by the Supreme Court. Supervisors or administrators who know (or should have known) about the sexual harassment of those working for them and yet do not take immediate action to stop it can be held accountable.

Ellis, Barak and Pinto (1991) and Fitzgerald and Ormerod (1991) refer to the difference between the perception of sexual harassment and objective incidents as the severity dimension: the more severe a harassment incident, the greater the tendency to label and personally perceive it as sexual harassment. This suggests that there are degrees of sexual harassment based on personal perception of the incident(s). Ellis, Barak and Pinto's (1991) study of 138 women in Israel found that women have a greater perception of sexual harassment the higher the status of the harasser and the more explicit the incident. Further, they found that women also based their perception of the incident on their perceived personal attractiveness. Malovich and Stake's (1990) research of 224 undergraduate students (113 women, 111 men) indicates that as the status of the harasser increases the more likely the victim of sexual harassment will press charges against the harasser. This may be due to the fact that women are more aware of victim's legal rights. Riger (1991) indicates that behavior is more likely to be labeled harassment when it is done by someone with greater power than the victim.

Additional studies suggest that definitions of sexual harassment vary in accordance with the gender of the perceiver, the traditional or nontraditional role held by the perceiver, and the status of the individuals involved (Ellis, Barak and Pinto, 1991). According to Malovich and Stake (1990), women more often than men perceive all acts of a sexual nature to

be offensive, persons who hold with a traditional view of gender roles are more likely to perceive only the most explicit sexual acts to be offensive, and as the status of the harasser increases the more likely the action will be perceived as offensive by the victim. Further, the setting in which harassment takes place also determines how severe the harassment is perceived (Gruber, 1992).

Prevention of Sexual Harassment

How can school districts comply with the law, eliminate sexual harassment, and be fair to all parties at the same time? A great many methods of treatment are being tried. There is no shortage of published and filmed materials designed to help students, teachers, and other staff members become better equipped to deal with these changing times. There are prepared curricula and handbooks containing a wealth of information: definitions of exactly what sexual harassment is, legal background and summaries of relevant laws, sample policies, instructions on how to conduct an investigation, lesson plans, overheads, scenarios for role-playing exercises, first-person accounts of actual incidents, newspaper clippings, quizzes to uncover preconceptions and misinformation, and videos that attempt to give the sense and feel of the issue.

Stein (1996) believes that the adults in the school environment are responsible for the confusion and resentment manifested by boys and girls alike. Adults have often marginalized the conversation about sexual

harassment into a boring, pedantic subject. Examples include assemblies where students are read the riot act of do's and don'ts of sexual harassment; pedagogically flat classroom lessons, which consist of list-making and reading aloud of the school's policy and legal definitions; and finger-pointing lectures by school board attorneys, district attorneys, or police officers who try to frighten the students into enlightenment. Furthermore, the manner in which adults have handled sexual harassment disputes has been arbitrary, inconsistent, or rigid and uninspired (Stein, 1996).

In Millis, Massachusetts, the school district has banned hand-holding, hugging, and other affectionate physical contact between students on school grounds (Maroney, 1995). School administrators devised this stunning prohibition after months of ignoring allegations by eleven (11) females that a star football player had sexually assaulted them. The young man later pleaded guilty to one count of statutory rape and several counts of assault, for which he earned an eighteen-month prison sentence.

The Montgomery County District of Silver Spring, Maryland tried to resolve sexual harassment disputes by requiring students to face-off with each other, or sometimes in the presence of a peer mediator. While some educators view face-offs as an opportunity for victimized students to feel empowered or reclaim their voice, this questionable technique bought the district a lawsuit.

In December, 1992, after an assistant principal required a girl to confront her attacker, alone in a room, the conversation resulted in a screaming match between the two, as well as a lawsuit against the district (Peller, 1993; Sherrod, 1993, 1994; Sullivan , 1993). The district's December, 1993 letter of agreement, signed by the superintendent with the U. S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights, stated that it will no longer "require or direct a complainant to attend a face-to-face meeting, or confront in any way, the alleged harasser in a complaint of sexual harassment" (Montgomery County Public School's,. 1993).

Another technique gaining popularity with school personnel is to have the target or victim of sexual harassment write a letter to the harasser. Mary Rowe (1981) first developed this technique; later she and Nan Stein (1996) adapted it for use with high school students.

Collaborating with an adult trained in this technique, the student may find writing a letter to the harasser a positive, even therapeutic, experience. In fact, letter-writing can become part of a larger "talk back" curriculum of activism and empowerment. Cooperation with a school staff member accomplishes other important goals: the target of the harassment discusses personal feelings about the incident with someone; the incident is documented; and only a few people are involved, thus maintaining the privacy rights of both the alleged harasser and the victim Stein (1986).

Letter-writing, however, is not a comprehensive approach to sexual harassment. It does nothing to address the negative experiences of students

who witnessed or heard about the incident. For that reason, letter-writing cannot take the place of strategies such as training programs, support groups, discipline codes, and grievance procedures. Most egregiously, this technique places the burden of responsibility on the target of the harassment, and not on the school personnel whose responsibility it is to create an environment that is free from sexual harassment (Stein, 1996).

Other districts have imported the rights of citizens as guaranteed by the U. S. Constitution - that of a trial by a jury of one's peers and for the accursed to confront his or her accuser - into disciplinary proceedings for sexual harassment accusations.

Other strategies that have found their way into schools include restraining orders. In January, 1991, in Massachusetts, as in many other states, couples involved in "significant dating relationships" were added to the list of people eligible for court orders, known as 209a's, to protect them from harm (Locy, 1994).

In cases such as the above scenario (between a popular male student and an accusing female), administrators have found themselves in the untenable position of having to enforce restraining orders in their buildings. Other scenarios might include a teenage couple ending their dating relationship under bitter circumstances, or a student stalking another student who is not interested in having a close, personal relationship (Locy, 1994).

A more common approach to dealing with the issue is to set up workshops, either districtwide or held at individual schools. Many districts

are trying to see that all employees--including bus drivers and janitors--attend them. They want everyone to know what the state and federal laws have to say on the subject, to be able to identify what behavior is and is not sexual harassment, and to know what the district's policies and procedures are (Locy, 1994).

The EEOC (1990) suggests:

> Prevention is the best tool to eliminate sexual harassment in the workplace. Employers are encouraged to take steps necessary to prevent sexual harassment from occurring. They should clearly communicate to employees that sexual harassment will not be tolerated. They can do so by establishing an effective complaint or grievance process and taking immediate and appropriate action when an employee complains.

The elimination of sexual harassment from our schools and the creation of an equitable educational environment for all students requires comprehensive, concerted action by school districts that is supported by their communities. Experts who have studied this issue maintain that, when schools get involved in training, it is important to identify unacceptable behavior and to enjoin students from engaging in it, but at the same time it is important to urge people not to suffer in silence. However, that imposes a

responsibility on schools to designate and train personnel. If students are being urged to come forward, school personnel must know precisely what the law says, what students' rights and options are, how to conduct investigations, and what strategies are available for resolving the situation (Yaffe, 1995).

Training is essential (Linn, et al., 1992) if school districts are going to help students and avoid liability. Parent meetings, Linn maintains, are crucial. Parents must be made to understand the rules of the school.

Webb (1991) lays out six necessary factors for controlling sexual harassment:

a.) Top Management's Support. Leaders of organizations must view harassment as a legal and a business problem--one that interferes with productivity. By adopting a serious attitude, top management influences the way people approach the problem.

b.) A Written, Posted Policy. A verbal policy is the same thing as no policy at all, and even when they are written, policies serve little purposes unless they are very visible.

c.) A Procedure For Handling Complaints. The usual practice of having the supervisor as the first contact can create problems. Give employees the option of going to any of several people who are perceived as credible, objective and sensitive to the problem.

d.) A Timetable For Handling Complaints. When actually addressing complaints, it is important to act quickly and fairly and to respond to everyone involved: the alleged harasser, the alleged victim and the rest of the work group.

e.) Training Programs. The emphasis should be on behavioral changes more than attitudinal one.

f.) Follow-up. Continue employee training on an annual basis, provide introductory training for all new employees and an update session for those newly promoted into management, and once or twice a year send a memo reminding staffers of how the company feels about harassment.(p. 79).

Sexual Harassment and School Climate

School climate is based on a mix of attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors of everyone who lives and works in the school. Only recently has the educational literature analyzed that much of what goes on in an organization is governed by climate, including a way of behaving and surviving. The school climate is not opposed to change or innovation; schools have evolved considerably in policies, programs, and functions and have responded to the changing demands of society (Liebermann, 1988). The climate of a school establishes certain restrictions and regularities on teachers, students and

administrators, to effect reform, reformers cannot interfere with or violate the established norms and behaviors of the organization.

Organizational climate is the total environmental quality within a school department, a school building, or a school district. Organizational climate can be expressed by such adjectives as open, bustling, warm, easy going, informal, cold, impersonal, hostile, rigid and closed (Smircich, 1983).

Although written policies are important, organizational climate probably plays an even more significant role in legitimizing or discouraging sexual harassment. As Sharon Howard (1991) states, "where women are devalued . . . an atmosphere is created in which sexual harassment may flourish." to be maximally effective, efforts to combat sexual harassment must focus not only on enacting policies but on creating an institutional climate that is free from gender inequalities.

Dr. Paludi noted that sexual harassment can be defined from an organizational perspective. A major barrier to the general acceptance that sexual harassment is a devastating force in our society continues to be the widespread belief that it is a matter of personal relations outside of an institution and unrelated to the institution's powers and prerogatives. However, the reality is that the structure and culture of an organization interact with psychological dynamics to increase women's and some men's vulnerability to sexual harassment. Dr. Paludi offers that,

> Since work and academic organizations are defined by vertical stratification and asymmetrical relations between

> supervisors and subordinates, teachers and students, can use the power of their position to extort sexual gratification from their subordinates. In sexual harassment, the harasser is an individual who holds expert and informational power in an academic or work setting, e.g., grades, letters of recommendation, promotions and raises. Thus, sexual harassment is about an abuse of power, both sociocultural and organizational power (Fitzgerald, 1990).

Dr. Nan Stein (1993), one of the leading authorities on sexual harassment in elementary and secondary school, has described the harm that unaddressed sexual harassment causes in schools:

> Problems in schools fester, spawning an atmosphere that permits and tolerates, at a minimum, sexual harassment and discrimination, denying students the right to an equal educational opportunity and equal protection under the law. Other more cynical lessons also are taught by such behaviors: schools become unsafe places and students lose confidence in school policies and trust for school officials. These consequences are felt not only by victims and subjects, but also by bystanders, whether they are innocent witnesses or deliberate colluders (p. 18).

The Wellesley College research report (1993) found that: too many of our schools have become unsafe, uncaring and unjust. Students have a right to expect that if something frightening, unpleasant or illegal is happening in school - especially if it is occurring in public - someone in authority will intervene to stop it. They also deserve to be believed when they report an incident. Yet sexual harassment seems, for the most part, to proceed without adult interventions. The lessons of silence and neglect resulting from official inaction not only affect the subjects of sexual harassment, they also spread to the bystanders and witnesses. Boys as well as girls become mistrustful of adults who fail to intervene, to provide equal protection and to safeguard the educational environment. Significant numbers of girls reported that harassment made them not want to go to school (33%), not want to talk in class (32%), made it harder for them to pay attention in class (28%), lowered their grades on tests (23%), made it hard to study (22%) and even made some of them think about changing schools (17%). Smaller percentages of boys also experienced these reaction to harassment.

A hostile environment in an educational setting is not created by simple childish behavior or by an offensive utterance, comment, or vulgarity, rather, Title IX is violated when the educational environment is permeated with discriminatory intimidation, ridicule, and insult that is "sufficiently severe or pervasive to alter the conditions of the victim's environment and create an abusive environment (quoting Meritor, 477 U.S. at 64-65, 106 S. Ct. at 2404)."

Management, faculty, students, and staff, at all levels, are responsible for maintaining an appropriate environment for study and work. The school is supposed to create and maintain an atmosphere that is not intimidating, hostile, or offensive - a place where you can work and learn.

Summary

Sexual harassment is about the abuse of power. It is not about sex. It is not about romance. In our society, power is derived from many sources. Large corporations have sexual harassment problems, as do small businesses, local governments, schools and not-for-profit organizations. No one is immune.

This review of literature examined the complex issue of sexual harassment from different views and perspectives. It is applicable for educators trying to define, recognize, and prevent sexual harassment. Although different, the studies are not mutually exclusive and there is meaningful agreement in the following areas:

1. Sexual harassment is a serious problem. The extent of the harassment is influenced by the perception.

2. Most victims of sexual harassment are women. Almost every research study on the topic reports that women are significantly more likely to experience sexual harassment than men. Even Hazzard (1989), whose article emphasizes incidents where men are the victims of sexual harassment, states that male victims are rare. Males, however, can be and are victims. Hoffmann (1986), who presents the

feminist theory of sexual harassment in academia, acknowledges that it is possible for women in authority to sexually harass men.

3. Sexual harassment exists and even flourishes in many school districts. The number of incidents in educational settings varies based on which behaviors are defined as sexual harassment, but even sexual assaults in schools are increasing. This is supported by the increased number

of newspaper articles and court cases involving alleged incidents of harassment in education.

4. Administrators have a legal and ethical responsibility to prevent sexual harassment in the educational environment. Even without legal precedent, the noble ideals of democracy indicate an ethical responsibility to provide a harassment - free environment.

5. In order to create a school climate of equality, it is imperative that a strong stand be taken by organizational leaders against all such acts of sexual harassment.

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Introduction

In this chapter, the researcher relates variables used in the study, gives the operational definitions of specific variables and presents the hypotheses. The purpose of this study is to examine the attitudes and perceptions of school administrators and teachers toward Sexual Harassment.

The assumption in this study is that there are certain factors, independent variables, that impact the attitudes of school administrators and teachers toward Sexual Harassment.

→	→	
Independent Variables	Modifying Variables	Dependent Variables
(Selected Administrators and Staff members)	Age Gender Marital Status Experience Race Education Level Present Position	Perceptions/Attitudes of Sexual Harassment

Definitions of Variables

The following definitions of variables will be used for the purpose of the study.

Dependent Variable

1. Perceptions/attitudes of MASD's administrators and faculty members - operational with instrument.

Independent Variables

1. Age - chronological age of school administrators and teachers with ranges below 30; 30-40; 41-50; and over 50.
2. Gender - male or female.
3. Educational level assigned - elementary school, middle school, and high school.
4. Marital Status - condition of either being single, married, widowed, divorced or separated.
5. Experience - the number of years at present position (e.g. administrator/faculty).
6. Race - the ethnicity most often identify with.
7. Present Position - administrator or faculty

Relationship Among Variables

Research in the area of sexual harassment is difficult, as its definition is based upon the perception of the individual (Bursik, 1992). It has only

been within the past ten to fifteen years that research has been conducted on sexual harassment as the public and those in academia have become aware of the importance of the issue. Very little, if any, research has been done in the area of public education and sexual harassment, e. g. elementary, middle, and high schools. Research on sexual harassment and education has mostly been confined to higher education. Sexual harassment is not a new problem but has been hard to study due to the lack of a common definition and the use of a standardized instrument so that results could be compared across studies (Fitzgerald et al., 1988).

Of all proposed models, the Fitzgerald, Hulin & Drasgow model (as described in Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993) is potentially the most appropriate to examine sexual harassment. The current study considers perception, or meaning an administrator or faculty member give to an experience, as a potential variable which might impact the reporting of experience. The Fitzgerald et al. model (as described in Fitzgerald & Shullman, 1993) does not specifically address perception. However, there is some research (Mazer & Percival, 1989) which suggests that a relationship exists between perception of sexual harassment and attitude towards sexual harassment. Also, Terpstra and Baker (1986) recognize perception of experience as a factor equal in importance as the actual behaviors which define the experience.

Individual differences affect perceptions of sexual harassment according to several studies. Fitzgerald et al. (1988) found two variables

that contributed to differences in perception, that of age and severity of the harassment event. As most studies have focused on the definition and incidences of sexual harassment, more research is needed in the area of individual differences (Rubin & Borgers, 1990).

A study designed to further clarify the perceptions of sexual harassment by women was conducted by Jaschik and Fretz (1991). The hypothesis tested was "whether women would more likely label behaviors as sexual harassment, if they had been cued with the term, than if they had not" (p. 20).

Loredo, Reid, and Deaux (1995) examined how high school students perceive incidents of possible sexual harassment toward students and how they define sexual harassment. Thirty five (35) male and thirty eight (38) female high school seniors (mean age 16.8 years) evaluated scenarios that varied the type of sexual harassment, the status of the initiator (either teacher or student), and the gender composition of the dyad (either male toward female or female toward male). As predicted, type of harassment influenced ratings of severity. Compared to male students, female students rated the scenarios as more severe. Teachers were judged more critically than students. Differences in status were more apparent at less severe levels of harassment. In defining harassment, students relied on four factors: the behavior itself, the target's reaction to the behavior, the perpetrator's intentions, and the relationship that existed between the two people.

Roscoe, Strouse, Jeremiah, and et al. (1994) examined adolescents' experiences with sexual harassment behaviors. Two hundred and eighty one (281) female and two hundred and eighty (280) male students (aged 11-16 years) completed a questionnaire regarding their experiences with sexual harassment by peers; sexually harassing behaviors included sexual comments, telephone calls, pressure for dates, and sexual advances. Fifty percent (50%) of girls and approximately thirty seven percent (36.8%) of boys reported experiencing at least one sexually harassing behavior. The most common forms of harassment were sexual comments, physical contact, and telephone calls. Both girls and boys were highly unaccepting of sexually harassing behaviors.

Jones and Remland (1992) examined the perceptions of and responses to harassment by studying the effects of severity of harassment, target responses, target gender, rater gender, perpetrator appropriateness, and target appropriateness. A factorial analysis was conducted with 94 male and 116 female students from two eastern universities. The sample was approximately 90% Caucasian and was composed of undergraduate students ages 18 to 22 years. The subjects were randomly selected. Vignette research was the method used to obtain comparative reactions to certain situations. Results showed that all independent variables affected perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment situations. The conclusions indicated that there are many factors that can affect the perception of harassment which supports the research finding that sexual

harassment is difficult to define because of differences in individual experiences.

A quantitative study by Fitzgerald and Hesson-McInnis (1989) selected 28 advanced students to complete 200 paired comparisons of situations describing sexual harassment in a university setting. These students were selected due to the demanding nature of the experiment. The study was designed to examine the concept of sexual harassment and to determine the factors that influence an individual's perception of it. The results indicated that type and severity of sexual harassment influenced perceptions of it which confirmed a previous study (Fitzgerald, 1988). The type of harassment referred to *quid pro quo* and *hostile environment.* The study could not be generalized, due to the small sample size, but suggestions for future research were indicated. There is a need for definition consensus and a need to determine the difference in gender reactions to sexual harassment for empirical clarity.

Males and females often differ in their perceptions of what constitutes sexual harassment. According to Rubin and Borgers (1990), "due to the higher rate of victimization, more information exists on female perceptions of sexual harassment than on males" (p. 407). Several studies have documented that in most sexual harassment situations, the male is the harasser, usually a figure of power and often older, while the victim is usually female, younger and subordinate in status.

Corbett, Gentry, et al. (1993) surveyed one hundred and eighty five (185) undergraduates (49% female) regarding frequency and seriousness of sexual harassment in their high schools. Most respondents did not think that sexual harassment by high school teachers was frequent or serious, but half cited examples of such incidents involving other students. Approximately 6% of the respondents reported having personally experienced sexually inappropriate attention from high school teachers. Over one-third noted that they knew of a sexual relationship between a high school student and a teacher. In these cases, the majority of the respondents thought the student and the teacher were equally interested in the affair.

Another study that documented the differences in male and female perceptions of harassment was by Kenig and Ryan (1986). Participants included male and female faculty, staff, and students at a large university. The research determined that females consistently tended to define certain behaviors as harassment more often than males, suggesting that females may be more sensitive to this issue. Padgitt and Padgitt (1986), in a similar study, also found that females were more likely to define certain behaviors as sexually harassing than males. Finally, it was suggested that females felt that the university should have been pivotal in controlling harassing behavior, but males minimized the organization's responsibility.

Bursik (1992) examined the influence of gender, gender roles, and the power of the harasser on the perception of sexual harassment in the academic situation. The sample consisted of 73 females and 51 male

students at an urban commuter university. Half of the students were given a series of unequal power vignettes while the other half were given equal power vignettes. They were not told that the study concerned sexual harassment. The results suggested that the power of the harasser does affect the perception of harassment. Gender and gender roles were not found to be significant in this study.

Tata (1993) examined the impact of three factors (categories of sexually harassing behavior, gender of students, and hierarchical level of the initiator relative to the recipient) on students' perceptions of sexual harassment. Fifty (50) male and seventy (70) female undergraduates completed an instrument incorporating fifteen (15) incidents dealing with sociosexual behavior in an organizational setting. Results indicate that gender and hierarchical level influenced the perceptions of two categories of sexual harassment (gender harassment and seductive behavior) but did not influence perceptions of sexual bribery, sexual coercion, and sexual assault.

Lott et al. (1982) found a possible explanation in a study that determined that males were more accepting of harassing behaviors than females. Kenig and Ryan (1986) noted in their study that males believe that females contribute to their own harassment. It was also found that males believe that sexual harassment should be handled privately while females feel that the university should be a responsible party. These findings showed that gender and gender role do play a part in the complex sexual harassment

issue. There is a demonstrated need for reeducation of both males and females in the assignment of responsibility (Rubin & Borgers, 1990).

Jones and Remland (1992) used a social exchange theory to explain sexual harassment interaction in terms of perceived or actual inequities in incurred costs or rewards between targets and perpetrators. A factorial experiment examined the effects of severity of sexual harassment, target response, target gender, and rater gender on perceptions of harassment, perpetrator appropriateness, and target appropriateness and on suggested responses to harassment. Ninety four (94) male and one hundred and sixteen (116) female undergraduates served as students. All independent variables affected perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment situations.

Research has examined the prevalence and characteristics of sexual harassment policies to date. Various studies discuss the role that policy-making plays in further defining sexual harassment, and the importance of action by the university community in the definition, however, there are very few studies indicating the impact of policies on the incidence of sexual harassing behaviors (Williams, Lam & Shively, 1992).

While the research does not provide many statistics about the importance of policy in lowering the instances of sexual harassment, the general consensus is that having a policy does contribute to fewer harassment experiences because education of the academic community allows its members to understand the parameters within which they may

move (Williams et al. 1992; Brandenburg, 1982; Schneider, 1987). Further research is needed to determine actual statistics.

Null Hypotheses

Ho1: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho3: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho4: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment.

Ho5: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho6: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho7: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho8: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment.

Ho9: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho10: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho11: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho12: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment.

Ho13: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho14: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho15: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho16: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment.

Ho17: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho18: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho19: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho20: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment.

Ho21: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho22: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho23: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho24: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment.

Ho25: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Ho26: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Ho27: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Ho28: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations associated with this research effort are as follow:

1. The administrators chosen will be limited to principals and assistant principals.
2. Findings are/will be based on the voracity of respondents to the questionnaire.

Summary

The perceptions of sexual harassment were found to differ according to the individual in such areas as age and severity of the event (Fitzgerald et al., 1988). Gender differences were found to exist in several studies with females perceiving events as sexually harassing more often than males (Kenig & Ryan, 1986).

Definitions of sexual harassment varied based upon the individual's perception of it, according to most research cited (Jones & Remland, 1992; Bursik, 1992; Fitzgerald & Hesson-McInnis, 1989). Studies concerning attitudes toward sexual harassment found that personality and gender differences affected the perceptions of it (McKinney, 1990; Malovich & Stake, 1990). Finally, while there are few statistics to indicate that the

existence of a policy will decrease sexual harassment, research reported that policy can assist in defining it (Williams et al., 1992).

Several needs were cited in the research of the literature. As most of the research uses only female subjects, it was suggested that samples should be randomly selected of both males and females. As in any study, there was a need cited to increase return rates. This is particularly difficult in studying sexual harassment because the subject matter is sensitive. Finally, it was suggested that if research is to assist those who make policy, actual behaviors must be surveyed and a common definition found (Rubin & Borgers, 1990).

Adams et al. (1983) reported that many instances of sexual harassment often are unreported. This is of concern in that as a researcher, it is difficult to gather accurate statistics. Thus, the process for reporting harassment must be easily accessible for all. In addition, since findings indicate that females and males have different experiences and attitudes about sexual harassment, the reporting process must be comfortable for both (Riger, 1991). Kenig and Ryan (1986) found that females were more likely to define behaviors as harassing while males were more likely to believe victims contributed to their own problems. Males may be more tolerant of reporting procedures, as they have little need for them. The power differential is central to the sexual harassment dilemma and must be addressed for possible misuse by administrators who make policy (Rubin & Borgers, 1990).

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the procedures that was used in data collection and analysis of data in the study of the attitudes and perceptions of administrators and faculty members toward sexual harassment in three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. This discussion includes a description of the population, a discussion of the selection of the sample, materials used including the survey instrument, and the procedures used in the statistical analysis of the collected data.

Research Design

This study was conducted to examine the attitudes of administrators and faculty members toward sexual harassment in three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts and to determine the relationship to demographic variables. Causal-comparative method was the research design used for this study. According to Borg and Gall (1989), the causal-comparative method is aimed at the discovery of possible causes and effects

of a behavior pattern or personal characteristic by comparing subjects in whom this pattern or characteristic is present with similar subjects in which it is absent or present to a lesser degree (p. 537).

Population

This study was conducted in forty selected schools from three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. Fifteen schools, including elementary, middle, and high, was used from two of the selected districts and ten schools from one district. The population in these schools consists of certified administrators and faculty who have met the local and state requirements. The sample for this study consisted of all the administrators in each school and ten faculty members in each of the forty selected schools.

Instrumentation

The survey instrument was developed by Linda Shonesy (1993). It consists of four sections with a total of twenty seven questions. The design of the instrument incorporated several questions developed from two separate studies on sexual harassment by McKinney (1989) and Grauerhoiz (1989). These questions were modified for use in this study. The areas addressed included background information, sexual harassment behaviors, experiences, and attitudes. The time required to respond to the survey was approximately ten minutes. The instrument consisted of a five-point Likert-type scale, which presented statements about sexual harassment issues. Responses varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Section two of the instrument assessed opinions about sexual harassment behaviors, which was intended to define the subject for the purposes of this study. The format for this section was a five-point Likert-type scale.

Section three of the instrument sought to ascertain faculty and administrative experiences with sexual harassment. This section was designed to determine the degree to which sexual harassment has occurred in the three MASD. Inferences were made concerning the differences in experiences between faculty and administrators. The five-point Likert-type scale was used for this section.

Section four of the instrument was designed to measure the attitudes of the respondent about harassment issues to further define the individual's perceptions of sexual harassment. Areas covered included attitudes about the victim, attitudes concerning the harasser, and attitudes regarding the seriousness of sexual harassment behaviors. By determining attitudes toward harassing behaviors and issues, inferences were made, using the background information, as to the differences of faculty and administrator's perceptions of sexual harassment. The format was the five-point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree.

Shonesy (1993) did a pre-test of the survey instrument. The instrument was modified based upon comments received from pilot responses. Both content validity and reliability of the instrument were assessed. The instrument was submitted to a validation group for evaluation.

Revisions were made based upon the recommendations of the group. Content validity was also developed using the review of literature to develop the instrument. An item analysis was performed to estimate the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument, using the SAS program and its feature Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha. The internal reliability consistency was 65% (Shonesy, 1993).

Data Collection Procedure

According to Mickler, Chissom and McLean (1989), the most frequently used method to obtain a self-administered survey is the mailed survey. The researcher selected elementary, middle and high schools from three Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts for participation in this study. A universal sample was used in that all administrators in each building will be included in the sample. A letter of introduction, which explained the purpose of the study, was sent to the administrators and teachers requesting their participation in the study. Copies of the instrument (Sexual Harassment Survey) was delivered to the selected schools. On the cover of the survey, a statement was included indicating that participation was voluntary and that responses would remain confidential. Detailed instructions were provided to the respondent to assist in filling out the survey. It took approximately ten minutes to read and complete the survey. Administrators and teachers were asked to return the survey to a designated

person at a specified time. The designated person kept the completed surveys until they are picked up by the researcher.

Personal Data Sheet

The Personal Data Sheet consisted of seven demographical variables. They were: participant's gender, race, marital status, age, present position, level of position, and number of years experience in present position. The format provided a check-off response.

Statistical Applications

Following the completion of the gathering of data, the analysis process was begun. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC) (Norusis, 1991) was used to analyze the data.

The analysis of variance was used to determine whether the groups differ significantly among themselves on the variables being studied. When the analysis of variance yields a non significant *F* ratio (the ratio of between-groups variance to within-groups variance), the computation of *t*-tests to compare pairs of means was not appropriate. But when the *F* ratio was statistically significant, the researcher used *t*-tests to determine which group means differ significantly from one another. The number of subjects influences the F-ratio; the larger the number, the larger the numerator becomes. When the numerator was greater than the denominator, the

researcher consulted the table of F-values to determine whether the ratio was greater enough to reject the null hypothesis at the predetermined level.

The Scheffe *t*-test for multiple comparisons was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data.

The t-test was used to determine the extent of relationship between the perception of sexual harassment and the variable as related to hypotheses one through twelve. The *F* ratio was used to determine the extent of relationship between the perception of sexual harassment and the variable as related to hypotheses thirteen through twenty-eight. Descriptive statistics was used to address frequencies of responses. A tabular format will be used along with descriptions of the analyses and results.

Summary

Chapter IV introduced the research design, a description of the population used in the study, the instrumentation, procedures for data collection and the statistical treatment of the collected data and summary.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The primary purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment in three metropolitan school districts. A secondary purpose was to determine the perceptions of administrators and faculty as to the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment. The third purpose of the study was to ascertain whether the presence of a sexual harassment policy will impact the perceptions of sexual harassment. Finally, the fourth purpose of the study was to add to the body of knowledge about sexual harassment, using administrators and faculty populations, because of the power role that they have in schools.

Chapter V reports the results of the data analysis. The findings are presented in narrative form, accompanied by tables where appropriate. The hypotheses and research questions are used to organize and present the results. The information is presented by restating the hypotheses, presenting the statistical decision about the null hypothesis, and providing an

interpretation of the data to support or fail to support the hypothesis. Certain demographic information is presented using descriptive statistics.

Population and Collection of Data

The population consisted of administrators employed by one of the three metropolitan school districts and defined as those individuals who hold the title of principal or assistant principal. It also consisted of faculty employed by one of the three metropolitan school districts.

A survey packet containing the instrument, a cover letter, and a letter supporting the research from the district was left with principals at 34 schools (15 - elementary, 11 - middle, 8 - high). A total of four hundred and seventy survey packets were delivered. Two hundred and thirty two (49.361 %) were returned from 25 schools (15 elementary, 6 middle, and 4 high).

Table 1

Return Rate of Questionnaires by Present Position

Questionnaires	Number Issued	Number Returned	Percent of Total
	470		
Administrators		23	4.8936 %
Faculty		209	44.4681 %
Total Return		232	49.3617 %

Background Information

The survey instrument was divided into four sections (See Appendix A). The first section was composed of general background or demographic questions. The second section was composed of questions relating to perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors. The third section asked about survey participants' perceptions of experiences with sexual harassment, and the fourth section surveyed perceptions of attitudes toward sexual harassment.

The respondents were asked to provide the researcher with certain background information in the first section. Data were gathered relative to the gender of the participant, the age of the participant, the number of years of service in present position of the participant, the level (elementary, middle or high school) at which the participant works, and the present position of the participant The background data were analyzed for the total sample of administrators and faculty, and were also analyzed separately for each group. Simple frequency distributions and percentages were generated for this information collected.

Summary of Survey Responses

The instrument consists of a five-point Likert-type scale, which presents statements about sexual harassment issues. Responses varied from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The Mean scores can be interpreted using Table 2.

Table 2

Mean Scores Interpretations		
1.	Strongly Agree	1.00 - 1.49
2.	Agree	1.50 - 2.49
3.	No Opinion	2.50 - 3.49
4.	Disagree	3.50 - 4.49
5.	Strongly Disagree	4.50 - 5.00

Items 1 through 7 (Part I) of the survey instrument were used to define the participants. Items 8 through 17 (Part II) of the survey instrument were designed to ascertain the survey participants' perceptions of the behaviors that could be defined as sexual harassment. Items 18 through 23 (Part III) of the survey instrument were designed to ascertain the survey participants' perceptions of the experiences that could be defined as sexual harassment. Items 24 through 34 (Part IV) of the survey instrument were designed to ascertain the survey participants' perceptions of the attitudes that could be defined as sexual harassment.

Statistical Analyses of Data

Results of this study are presented for each of the twenty-eight (28) null hypotheses tested. Each null hypothesis corresponds to specific survey items and was tested using the t-test or the F ratio at the .05 level of

significance. The purpose of this analysis was to determine any statistically significant differences in responses of administrators and faculty in their perceptions of sexual harassment.

Null Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 1 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding the behaviors that constitute sexual harassment. This assisted in defining sexual harassment for purposes of the survey. Question 5 and the totals of questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors (8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 16 and 17) were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 1 is summarized in Table 3.

Table 3

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 1

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Administrators	23	1.5522	.504	.105
Faculty	193	1.9902	.887	.064

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	-2.32	214	.021	.189
Unequal	-3.56	40.55	.001	.123

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions behaviors that constitute sexual harassment in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level. The analysis yielded a t-test value of -2.32 at 214 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of -3.56 at 40.55 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment experiences in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 2 was designed to compare the impact that experiencing sexual harassment has on the perceptions of administrators and faculty in determining which behaviors constitute sexual harassment in the three metropolitan Atlanta districts. Survey question 5 and the totals of questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences (questions 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23) were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t est analysis of null hypothesis 2 is summarized in Table 4.

Table 4

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 2

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Administrators	22	2.5833	.925	.197
Faculty	180	2.6685	.771	.057

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	-.48	200	.633	.178
Unequal	-.41`	24.70	.682	.206

There was significant difference found between administrators and faculty who had experienced sexual harassment and their perceptions regarding which behaviors constitute sexual harassment at the .05 ($p < .05$) level. The analysis yielded a t test value of -.48 at 200 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of -.41 at 24.70 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 3 was designed to test the differences in perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding attitudes about sexual harassment. The t test was used to test for differences between attitudinal means. Survey question 5 and the totals of questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes (questions 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34) were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 3 is summarized in Table 5.

Table 5

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 3

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Administrators	23	2.8735	.337	.070
Faculty	186	2.8803	.370	.027

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	- .08	207	.934	.081
Unequal	- .09	28.99	.929	.075

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions regarding attitudes that exist about sexual harassment in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level. The analysis yielded a t-test value of -.08 at 207 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of -.09 at 28.99 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value for t was 1.96. The calculated values for t was less than the critical value, therefore, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 4; There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment in three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts.

Null hypothesis 4 was designed to determine the differences in the perceptions of two groups, administrators and faculty, regarding sexual harassment in three selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts. Survey questions 5 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors (questions 8 - 17), Sexual Harassment Experiences (questions 18 - 23) and Sexual Harassment Attitudes (questions 24 - 34) were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 4 is summarized in Table 6 .

Table 6

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 4

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Administrators	22	2.3466	.492	.105
Faculty	161	2.5016	.512	.040

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	-1.34	181	.183	.116
Unequal	-1.38	27.60	.179	.112

There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment in three metropolitan school districts at the .05 ($p > .05$) level. The analysis yielded a t-test value of -1.34 at 181 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of -1.38 at 27.60 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 5: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three selected MASD.

Null hypotheses 5 was designed to test the difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment behaviors based on gender (1 - male, 2 - female). Survey question 1 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 5 is summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 5

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Male	39	2.0795	1.198	.192
Female	178	1.9219	.778	.058

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	1.03	215	.305	.153
Unequal	.79	45.27	.436	.201

There was no significant difference found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding prevalence of sexual harassment behaviors in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of 1.03 at 215 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of .79 at 45.27 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 6: There is no significant difference in perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment experiences in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 6 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment experiences and the gender of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey question 1 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 6 is summarized in Table 8.

Table 8

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 6

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Male	33	2.7121	.679	.118
Female	169	2.6489	.808	.062

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	.42	200	.674	.150
Unequal	.47	51.44	.638	.134

There was no significant difference found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding prevalence of sexual harassment experiences in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of .42 at 200 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of .47 at 51.44 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to rejected the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 7: There is no significant difference in perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 7 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes and the gender of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey question 1 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 7 is summarized in Table 9 .

Table 9

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 7

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Male	37	2.9140	.483	.079
Female	173	2.8734	.336	.026

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	.61	208	.540	.066
Unequal	.49	43.74	.083	.083

There was no significant difference found in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding prevalence of sexual harassment behaviors in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of .61 at 208 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of .49 at 43.74 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 8: There is no significant difference in perceptions of administrators and faculty based on gender regarding sexual harassment in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 8 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the gender of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 1 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for multiple comparisons was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 8 is summarized in Table 10.

Table 10

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 8

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Male	33	2.5649	.642	.112
Female	150	2.4650	.478	.039

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	1.02	181	.310	.098
Unequal	.84	40.16	.404	.111

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on gender in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of 1.02 at 181 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of .84 at 40.16 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypotheses 9: There is no significant difference in perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment behaviors in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 9 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors and the race of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey question 2 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 9 is summarized in Table 11.

Table 11

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 9

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Black 1	148	1.9486	.921	.076
White 2	68	1.9544	.753	.091

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	-.05	214	.964	.128
Unequal	-.05	156.85	.961	.119

No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on age in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a RANGE of 3.49. The critical value of the Scheffe test was .05.

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors based on age in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of -.05 at 214 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of

-.05 at 156.85 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypotheses 10: There is no significant difference in perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on the race of the administrators and faculty members in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 10 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment experiences and the race of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey question 2 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 10 is summarized in Table 12.

Table 12

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 10

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Black 1	141	2.7045	.816	.069
White 2	59	2.5452	.723	.094

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	1.30	198	.195	.123
Unequal	1.37	121.89	.174	.117

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on gender in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of 1.30 at 198 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of 1.37 at 121.89 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypotheses 11: There is no significant difference in perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment attitudes in three selected MASD.

Null hypothesis 11 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes and the race of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey question 2 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The Scheffe t-test for Independent Samples was used because it takes into account the probability that the researcher will find a significant difference between mean scores simply because many comparisons are made on the same data. A t test analysis of null hypothesis 11 is summarized in Table 13.

Table 13

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 11

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Black 1	148	2.8784	.393	.032
White 2	61	2.8882	.292	.037

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	-.18	207	.860	.056
Unequal	-.20	148.90	.842	.049

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on gender in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of -.18 at 207 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of -.20 at 148.90 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 12: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on race regarding sexual harassment.

Null hypothesis 12 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the race of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 2 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 12 is summarized in Table 14.

Table 14

Summary of t Test Analysis

Null Hypothesis 12

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Black 1	129	2.4907	.537	.047
White 2	61	2.4631	.451	.062

t Test for Equality of Means

Variances	t -value	df	2-Tail sig	SE of Diff
Equal	.33	180	.742	.084
Unequal	.35	114.46	.724	.078

There was no significant difference found between administrator and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on gender in three MASD at the .05 ($p < .05$) level of significance. The analysis yielded a t-test value of .33 at 180 degrees of freedom in an equal variance and a t value of .35 at 114.46 degrees of freedom in an unequal variance. The critical value of t was 1.96. Since the obtained t-test was less than the critical value of t, the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 13: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Null Hypothesis 13 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exist between perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors and the marital status (1 - married, 2 - widowed, 3 - divorced, 4 - separated and 5 - separated) of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey question 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 13 is summarized in Table 15.

Table 15

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 13

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	4	4.0963	.8471	1.3698	.2455
Within Grps	212	158.4862	.7476		
TOTAL	216	162.5825			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Married = 1	118	1.8576	.6301	.0580
Widowed = 2	6	1.9000	1.1225	.4583
Divorced = 3	33	2.2394	1.3195	.2297
Separated = 4	3	2.2667	1.1590	.6692
Single = 5	57	1.9632	.9194	.1218
Total	217	1.9502	.8676	.0589

The obtained F ratio of 1.3698 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .2455 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 14: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Null hypothesis 14 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment experiences and the marital status of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey question 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 14 is summarized in Table 16.

Table 16

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 14

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	4	4.5087	1.1272	1.8486	.1211
Within Grps	197	120.1190	.6097		
TOTAL	201	124.6278			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Married 1	107	2.5498	.7744	.0749
Widowed 2	7	3.1667	1.2210	.4615
Divorced 3	31	2.6452	.7325	.1316
Separated 4	3	2.6111	.5853	.3379
Single 5	54	2.8210	.7626	.1038
Total	202	2.6592	.7874	.0554

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on marital status in three MASD at

the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 1.8486 was not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .1211 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 15: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment attitudes.

Null hypothesis 15 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes and the marital status of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey question 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 15 is summarized in Table 17.

Table 17

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 15

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	4	.3051	.0763	.5675	.6865
Within Grps	205	27.5565	.1344		
TOTAL	209	27.8616			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Married = 1	116	2.8738	.3183	.0296
Widowed =2	7	3.0779	.5639	.2131
Divorced = 3	32	2.8750	.4674	.0826
Separated = 4	3	2.7879	.1892	.1093
Single = 5	52	2.8776	.3746	.0519
Total	210	2.8805	.3651	.0252

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual

harassment experiences based on marital status in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .5675 was not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .6865 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 16: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on marital status regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment.

Null Hypothesis 16 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the marital status of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 16 is summarized in Table 18.

Table 18

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 16

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	4	2.1773	.5443	2.1351	.0783
Within Grps	178	45.3800	.2549		
TOTAL	182	47.5573			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Married = 1	99	2.3967	.3894	.0391
Widowed = 2	5	2.9119	.7494	.3351
Divorced = 3	28	2.5562	.7150	.1351
Separated = 4	3	2.5552	.1648	.0952
Single = 5	48	2.5690	.5537	.0799
Total	183	2.4830	.5112	.0378

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on marital status in three MASD at

the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 2.1351 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .0783 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 17: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Null Hypothesis 17 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors and the age of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 4 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 17 is summarized in Table 19.

Table 19

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 17

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	4.5413	.8471	1.1236	.3405
Within Grps	212	159.8375	.7540		
TOTAL	215	162.3788			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Under 30 = 1	33	1.9455	.8269	.1439
30 - 40 = 2	73	1.9534	.7532	.0882
41 - 50 = 3	76	2.0553	1.0459	.1200
Over 50 = 4	34	1.7265	.6757	.1159
Total	216	1.9523	.8691	.0591

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.0000	4.7000
Grp 2	1.0000	5.0000
Grp 3	1.0000	7.1000
Grp 4	1.0000	4.3000
TOTAL	1.0000	7.1000

There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors based on age in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 1.1236 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .3405 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 18: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Null Hypothesis 18 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment experiences and the age of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 4 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 18 is summarized in Table 20.

Table 20

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 18

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	2.0199	.6733	1.0873	.3556
Within Grps	198	122.6078	.6192		
TOTAL	201	124.6278			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Under 30 = 1	32	2.7760	.7473	.1321
30 - 40 = 2	65	2.5436	.7314	.0907
41 - 50 = 3	73	2.6461	.8245	.0965
Over 50 = 4	32	2.8073	.8447	.1493
Total	202	2.6592	.7874	.0554

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.0000	4.6667
Grp 2	1.1667	5.0000
Grp 3	1.5000	5.3333
Grp 4	1.0000	4.3333
TOTAL	1.0000	5.3333

There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on age in three MASD at the .05 level of significance. The obtained F ratio of 1.0873 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .3556 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 19: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Null Hypothesis 19 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes and the age of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 4 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 19 is summarized in Table 21.

Table 21

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 19

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	.4220	.1407	1.0551	.3692
Within Grps	205	27.3269	.1333		
TOTAL	208	27.7488			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Under 30 = 1	32	2.8665	.2722	.0481
30 - 40 = 2	68	2.8944	.3504	.0425
41 - 50 = 3	75	2.9200	.4246	.0490
Over 50 = 4	34	2.7888	.3241	.0556
Total	209	2.8821	.3653	.0253

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	2.0909	3.2727
Grp 2	1.6364	4.0000
Grp 3	2.1818	5.0000
Grp 4	2.2727	3.6364
TOTAL	1.6364	5.0000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes based on age in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 1.0551 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .3692 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 20: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on age regarding sexual harassment.

Null Hypothesis 20 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the age of the administrators and faculty of MASD. Survey questions 4 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 20 is summarized in Table 22.

Table 22

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 20

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	.1966	.0655	.2477	.8629
Within Grps	179	47.3607	.2646		
TOTAL	182	47.5573			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Under 30 = 1	26	2.5044	.5101	.1000
30 - 40 = 2	61	2.4683	.4417	.0566
41 - 50 = 3	67	2.5142	.6070	.0742
Over 50 = 4	29	2.4225	.4156	.0772
Total	183	2.4830	.5112	.0378

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.6192	4.1222
Grp 2	1.4455	4.2424
Grp 3	1.7273	5.0000
Grp 4	1.7707	3.4566
TOTAL	1.4455	5.0000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on age in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .2477 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .8629 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 21: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Null Hypothesis 21 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the school level (Elementary = 1, Middle = 2, and High = 3) of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 21 is summarized in Table 23.

Table 23

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 21

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	2	1.7479	.8739	1.1628	.3146
Within Grps	214	160.8346	.7516		
TOTAL	216	162.5825			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Elementary =1	121	1.9438	.7549	.0686
Middle = 2	44	2.1045	1.1938	.1800
High = 3	52	1.8346	.7819	.1084
Total	217	1.9502	.8676	.0589

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.0000	5.0000
Grp 2	1.0000	7.1000
Grp 3	1.0000	4.7000
TOTAL	1.0000	7.1000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors based on school level in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 1.1628 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .3146 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 22: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Null Hypothesis 22 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the school level of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 22 is summarized in Table 24.

Table 24

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 22

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	2	.7712	.3856	.6196	.5392
Within Grps	199	123.8565	.6224		
TOTAL	201	124.6278			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Elementary =1	114	2.7076	.7762	.0727
Middle = 2	40	2.5500	.8583	.1357
High = 3	48	2.6354	.7584	.1095
Total	202	2.6592	.7874	.0554

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.1667	5.3333
Grp 2	1.1667	5.0000
Grp 3	1.0000	4.3333
TOTAL	1.0000	5.3333

No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level of significance. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on school level in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .6169 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .5392 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 23: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Null Hypothesis 23 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the school level of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 23 is summarized in Table 25.

Table 25

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 23

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	2	1.3179	.6589	5.1387	.0066
Within Grps	207	26.5437	.1282		
TOTAL	209	27.8616			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Elementary =1	117	2.9479	.3625	.0335
Middle = 2	45	2.8323	.3237	.0483
High = 3	48	2.7614	.3772	.0544
Total	210	2.8805	.3651	.0252

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	2.1818	5.0000
Grp 2	2.0909	3.4545
Grp 3	1.6364	4.0000
TOTAL	1.6364	5.0000

There was significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes based on school level in elementary schools in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 5.1387 is statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .0066 ($p<.05$), the researcher rejected the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 24: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment.

Null Hypothesis 24 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the school level of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 24 is summarized in Table 26.

Table 26

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 24

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	2	.4438	.2219	.8478	.4301
Within Grps	180	47.1135	.2617		
TOTAL	182	47.5573			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
Elementary =1	100	2.5196	.4577	.0458
Middle = 2	37	2.4862	.6570	.1080
High = 3	46	2.4009	.4907	.0724
Total	183	2.4830	.5112	.0378

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.6919	5.0000
Grp 2	1.6192	4.2606
Grp 3	1.4455	4.0000
TOTAL	1.4455	5.0000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment based on school level in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .8478 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .4301 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 25: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experience regarding sexual harassment behaviors.

Null Hypothesis 25 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the years of experience of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 7 (0 - 2 = 1, 3 - 10 = 2, 11 - 20 = 3, and over 20 = 4) and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 25 is summarized in Table 27.

Table 27

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 25

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	2.2876	.7625	1.0098	.3893
Within Grps	212	160.0912	.7551		
TOTAL	215	162.3788			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
0 - 2 =1	33	1.9394	.9902	.1724
3 - 10 = 2	83	1.9265	.8052	.0884
11 - 20 = 3	52	2.1192	.9973	.1383
Over 20 = 4	48	1.8250	.7268	.1049
Total	216	1.9523	.8691	.0591

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.0000	5.0000
Grp 2	1.0000	5.0000
Grp 3	1.0000	7.1000
Grp 4	1.0000	4.0000
TOTAL	1.0000	7.1000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment behaviors based on years of experience in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .1.0098 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .3893 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 26: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment experiences.

Null Hypothesis 26 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment experiences and the years of experience of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Experiences were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 26 is summarized in Table 28.

Table 28

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 26

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	2.3734	.7911	1.2813	.2820
Within Grps	198	122.2544	.6174		
TOTAL	201	124.6278			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
0 - 2 =1	33	2.8030	.8665	.1508
3 - 10 = 2	74	2.6351	.7639	.0888
11 - 20 = 3	50	2.5067	.6843	.0968
Over 20 = 4	45	2.7630	.8620	.1285
Total	202	2.6592	.7874	.0554

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.5000	5.0000
Grp 2	1.0000	5.3333
Grp 3	1.1667	4.3333
Grp 4	1.0000	4.8333
TOTAL	1.0000	5.3333

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on years of experience in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of 1.2813 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .2820 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 27: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Null Hypothesis 27 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes and the years of experience of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 27 is summarized in Table 29.

Table 29

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 27

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	.2488	.0829	.6182	.6040
Within Grps	205	27.5000	.1341		
TOTAL	208	27.7488			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
0 - 2 =1	31	2.9238	.5332	.0958
3 - 10 = 2	78	2.9114	.3080	.0349
11 - 20 = 3	51	2.8449	.3044	.0426
Over 20 = 4	49	2.8479	.3827	.0547
Total	209	2.8821	.3653	.0253

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.6364	5.0000
Grp 2	2.0909	4.0000
Grp 3	2.2727	3.6364
Grp 4	2.2727	4.0000
TOTAL	1.6364	5.1000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment attitudes based on years of experience in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .6182 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .6040 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Hypothesis 28: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on years of experiences regarding sexual harassment.

Null Hypothesis 28 was designed to determine whether a significant difference exists between perceptions of sexual harassment and the years of experience of the administrators and faculty of three MASD. Survey questions 3 and the totals of all the questions listed under Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Sexual Harassment Experiences and Sexual Harassment Attitudes were used to test this hypothesis.

The researcher used a Oneway Analysis of Variance test to find if a significant difference existed between mean scores. The F ratio analysis of null hypothesis 28 is summarized in Table 30.

Table 30

Summary of Analysis of Variance

Null Hypothesis 28

SOURCE	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Grps	3	.3187	.1056	.4000	.7532
Within Grps	179	47.0912	.2639		
TOTAL	182	47.5573			

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	SD	SE of Mean
0 - 2 =1	28	2.5771	.6932	.1310
3 - 10 = 2	71	2.4752	.4405	.0523
11 - 20 = 3	43	2.4461	.5205	.0794
Over 20 = 4	41	2.4709	.4823	.0753
Total	183	2.4830	.5112	.0378

GROUP	MINIMUM	MAXIMUM
Grp 1	1.4455	5.0000
Grp 2	1.6192	4.2424
Grp 3	1.6798	4.2606
Grp 4	1.7818	4.0000
TOTAL	1.4455	5.0000

The Scheffe test with significance level .05 was used. No two groups are significantly different at the .050 level. There was no significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions of sexual harassment experiences based on years of experience in three MASD at the .05 level. The obtained F ratio of .4000 is not statistically significant. Since the obtained value or F probability was .7532 ($p<.05$), the researcher failed to reject the null hypothesis.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of the data collected from responses of a selected sample of administrators and faculty in three metropolitan school districts regarding their perceptions of sexual harassment. A summary of data collection procedures and background information was presented. The statistical data from the testing of hypotheses were presented along with a summary of the t test analyses. Descriptive analyses, including percentages, frequencies, and mean scores, were performed to determine additional perceptions of the respondents.

Statistical analysis of the data collected in this study using t test and f value analysis resulted in the rejection of null hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. The only null hypothesis that was rejected at the .05 ($p< .05$) level of significance was Hypothesis 23: There is no significant difference in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding the prevalence of sexual harassment attitudes.

CHAPTER VI

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Findings

The perceptions of administrators and faculty regarding sexual harassment in three metropolitan school districts were examined in this study. This chapter contains a summary of the conclusions, implications, and recommendations emerging from the research.

Sexual harassment has only recently become an important issue to public schools. According to Fitzgerald et al, (1988), sexual harassment has been an issue that has been hard to study because of the lack of a common definition and the resulting inability to generalize data across studies. Studies have been generally limited to institutions of higher learning.

This study focused on three school districts in metropolitan Atlanta. The study was delivered to 15 elementary schools, 11 middle schools and 8

high schools within the tree districts. Only 15 elementary schools, 6 middle schools and 4 high schools returned the survey.

One population for the study consisted of administrators, defined as principals and assistant principals. The other population consisted of faculty, defined as certified teachers in the schools. Systematic random sampling was used to selected the survey respondents. A sample of 23 administrators and 209 faculty returned the survey. The survey instrument used by permission was developed by Linda Shonesy and taken through a content validity check, a field test, and statistical analyses. Using Cronback's Coefficient Alpha, the reliability of the instrument was found to be 65% or moderately positive.

Calculations and analysis of data were made using The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS/PC+). Twenty eight null hypotheses relating to perceptions of administrators and faculty were tested. A t test analysis was used to test the hypotheses at the .05 level of significance. Descriptive analyses of data, including frequencies, and mean scores, were used to generate data for hypotheses testing.

Conclusions

This study supports the following conclusions which relate to the research questions outlined in Chapter I. Based upon the statistical analysis reported in Chapter V, the study found that there is a significant difference

in the perceptions of administrators and faculty based on school level regarding sexual harassment attitudes.

Data analysis indicated that there is not a significant difference found between administrators and faculty perceptions regarding attitudes that exist about sexual harassment in total groupings three MASD.

It can be concluded from this study that there were no significant differences in perceptions of administrators and faculty as to sexual harassment in the three MASD. It was found that school level has a significant impact on the perceptions of administrators and faculty as to attitudes about sexual harassment.

School level was the only demographic variables that differentiated administrators and faculty regarding their attitudes toward sexual harassment.

Implications

Administrators and faculty of the three MASD, as well as other districts, should find the results of this study useful as the implications of possible sexual harassment are considered in the districts. Because legal penalties can be very costly to a district, prudent administrators must conduct assessments of their districts and take preventive measures to protect the district, the employee, and the student. The implications for faculty and administrators are equally as grave, when possible penalties are considered for the individual.

The results of this research, while not concluding that sexual harassment is a serious problem in the three MASD, do indicate that both male and females have been harassed. Any incidence of sexual harassment is a problem, and educational institutions must take preventive steps to ensure that it does not occur.

The role of the administrator and faculty member must be considered in discussing the implications of the findings of this study. Poor communication contributes to many problems that exist in school districts. Efforts should be made to ensure that open communication exists and that problems can be discussed with designated individuals. Communication is good preventive strategy.

Each district should develop a plan to determine potential problem areas and respond to those. This plan should include a process for assessment on a yearly basis. Policies and programs relative to sexual harassment should be reviewed, as should orientation and staff development programs. Individuals should be designated as contact persons for handling problems.

Employees of educational institutions often do not have the opportunity to study law and the methods available to handle situations, such as sexual harassment, unless special programs are provided to introduce these subjects. Since most educational institutions incorporate orientation programs for new employees, training workshops, and seminars into their

budgets each year, efforts should be made to provide information on sexual harassment. Not only should programs be made available to the new employee, but also current employees need to attend, so that they too receive information regarding policy and harassment issues.

Workshops or seminars should be held periodically to inform staff of the changes that have occurred over the course of a year. A discussion of important laws and recent court cases should be included to keep faculty and administrators abreast of developments that may affect their work or teaching performance. A discussion of agency law and the responsibility that employees have for their actions should also be included.

Staff development programs should be planned during the hours that will meet the needs of faculty, staff, and administrators. Administrators, Supervisors and managers have an opportunity to be a part of the preventive process. Supervisory training should be provided to all those who may at some point supervise another. It is often assumed that supervisors know how to treat others, and are aware of the legalities in the supervision process. To ensure that this is the case, training will provide the insurance that is needed for the district.

Employees of every district must be made aware of the potential legal implications involving sexual harassment. There are grave consequences for those who break the law, including monetary damages, loss of job, and convictions in the courts for very serious behaviors. Employees of educational institutions must be made aware of penalties associated with

sexual harassment, as well as the implications of violating agency law if acting outside their scope of authority.

Recommendations

Recommendations based upon the results of this study are as follow:

1. School districts should conduct an assessment to determine whether actual or potential problems exist, so that preventive steps may be taken.

The study revealed that 97 (41.81 %) of the respondents had no opinion as to sexual harassment being a serious problem in the district (see Appendix C, Table 11).

2. School districts should have clearly stated policies against sexual harassment that are posted and publicized.

The study revealed that 63 (27.1 %) had no opinion as to the sexual harassment policy of the district being adequate (see Appendix C, Table 11).

3. School districts' policies should provide a designated person or persons with whom to discuss problems relating to sexual harassment in a confidential manner.

4. Greater emphasis should be placed on seminars and training activities, including regular orientations for all district personnel and students, to provide information about policies and the law governing sexual harassment.

5. School districts should examine and analyze this study to develop a plan for assisting and preparing district personnel in the prevention of this problem.

This study revealed that: 86 (37.06 %) of the respondents had experienced some form of sexual harassment; 165 (71.11 %) believe that females experience sexual more often than males; 134 (67.75 %) believes sexual harassment policy deters potential problems; 150 (64.65 %) believe that knowledge of law deters sexual harassment; and 94 (40.08 %) believe that sexual harassment policy affects school climate (see Appendix C, Table 8).

6. Future research should be conducted to continue the development of a common definition of sexual harassment, so that findings can be generalized across studies.

7. Future research should be conducted to continue the development of a standardized instrument which would provide assistance to future researchers as data could be generalized across studies.

8. Additional research is needed to determine the perceptions of students regarding sexual harassment in school districts.

9. Additional research is needed to determine the perceptions of students, faculty, staff, and administrators regarding sexual harassment in school districts on a national basis.

10. Additional research is needed to determine the effectiveness of policies in deterring sexual harassment and to assess the emotional impact of sexual harassment on its victims.

11. Additional research is recommended to study the effects that sexual harassment may have upon the working and teaching environments of faculty and administrators, and the learning environment for students.

This study revealed that sexual harassment can effect the victims' attendance; has an adverse effect on school climate; and has an adverse effect on school climate (see Appendix C, Table 9).

These recommendations for further research are made based upon this study. There is a need to continue the search for an instrument that can be used across studies for research on faculty, administrators, staff and students. More research is needed on a national basis, as well as the state level. Every school district should undertake a study of its own to assess whether a problem exists and to ensure that policies and grievance procedures are in place.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

AND

COVER LETTER

1370 East Washington Avenue
East Point, Georgia 30344
(404) 768-1370

Dear Participant:

Sexual harassment as a social and legal issue and as a potential source for litigation has been not only in the headlines in recent years but has been prominent in both the Federal and State courts. It has become clear that it is necessary for school administrators and faculty to take an active role in the prevention of sexual harassment and in appropriate handling of complaints when they occur.

In partial fulfillment of the requirement for a doctorate in education degree at Clark Atlanta University, I am conducting a study of the attitudes of Metropolitan Atlanta school districts' administrators and faculty members toward sexual harassment.

I am seeking your assistance with a research project that involves Metropolitan Atlanta school districts. I am conducting a survey of the administrators and faculty to determine the perceptions about sexual harassment attitudes, experiences, and behaviors. Your participation is voluntary, all responses will remain completely confidential, and no individual school district or respondent will be identified in any report of this research. No results will be tallied by institution or by individual.

This study is being conducted to increase knowledge regarding sexual harassment, an issue that affects school districts by preventing a healthy learning and teaching environment. Your participation is extremely vital to my study.

Thank you very much for your cooperation in this effort.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Nash

A Perceptual Survey of Sexual Harassment Behaviors, Experiences, and Attitudes Among Selected Administrators and Faculty of Selected Metropolitan Atlanta School Districts

Please fill in the answers that best reflect your opinions about each question, and return the survey in the envelope provided.

I. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please provide the following information. Circle the appropriate responses.

1. Gender:
   (1) male (2) female

2. Race:
   (1) Black (2) White (3) Hispanic (4) Other

3. Marital Status:
   (1) Married (2) Widowed (3) Divorced (4) Separated (5) Single

4. Age as of your last birthday:
   (1) under 30 (2) 30 - 40 (3) 41 - 50 (4) over 50

5. Your present position:
   (1) Administrator (2) Faculty

6. The school level that you work:
   (1) elementary (2) middle (3) high

7. Number of years experience at present position (e. g. administrator and/or faculty):
   (1) 0 - 2 (2) 3 - 10 (3) 11 - 20) (4) over 20

II. SEXUAL HARASSMENT BEHAVIORS

Please circled one response which indicates the extent to which you feel the following may be sexual harassment.

1 Strongly Agree	2 Agree	3 No Opinion	4 Disagree	5 Strongly Disagree

8. Sexist comments: (jokes that are stereotypical or derogatory to member of your sex) 1 2 3 4 5

9.	Undue attention: (too helpful, too friendly, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
10.	Verbal sexual comments: (inquires about sexual values, remarks about dress, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
11.	Body language: (leering, standing too close, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
12.	Physical advances: (kissing, hugging, etc.)	1 2 3 4 5
13.	Explicit sexual propositions: (clear sexual invitation but with no threat)	1 2 3 4 5
14.	Sexual Assault: (actual or attempted rape)	1 2 3 4 5
15.	Sexual bribery: (sexual proposition with threats or promises made or implied)	1 2 3 4 5
16.	A term or condition of an individual's employment depends upon submission to unwelcomed sexual advances, request, and/or conduct that take place explicitly or implicitly.	1 2 3 4 5
17.	Sexual conduct that interferes with an individual's work performance or create an intimidating hostile, or offensive working environment.	1 2 3 4 5

III. SEXUAL HARASSMENT EXPERIENCES

The following questions ask about your past experiences with sexual harassment. Please circle the appropriate response.

18.	Would you agree that you have experienced one of the behaviors described in Section II, while employed by this district.	1 2 3 4 5
19.	To what extent would you agree that your experience was sexual harassment?	1 2 3 4 5
20.	Females experience instances of sexual harassment more often than males.	1 2 3 4 5
21.	The Sexual Harassment Policy of this district serves to deter potential problems.	1 2 3 4 5

22.	Knowledge of current sexual harassment law and the penalties involved serves to deter potential problems.	1 2 3 4 5
23.	The district's sexual harassment policy has affected school climate.	1 2 3 4 5

IV. SEXUAL HARASSMENT ATTITUDES

Many attitudes exist concerning the issue of sexual harassment. Circle the answer which best indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements:

24.	Sexual harassment is a serious problem in this district.	1 2 3 4 5
25.	Sexual harassment is a personal matter and this district should not become involved.	1 2 3 4 5
26.	Sexual harassment should be reported to someone in authority.	1 2 3 4 5
27.	Victims should ignore sexual harassment when it occurs.	1 2 3 4 5
28.	Victims of sexual harassment usually encourage this harassing behavior.	1 2 3 4 5
29.	Most sexual harassment charges are valid.	1 2 3 4 5
30.	Sexual harassers are usually aware that they are offending their victims.	1 2 3 4 5
31.	Sexual harassment can effect the victims' attendance.	1 2 3 4 5
32.	Sexual harassment has an adverse effect on school climate.	1 2 3 4 5
33.	Sexual harassment has an adverse effect on work attitudes.	1 2 3 4 5
34.	The sexual harassment policy in my district is adequate.	1 2 3 4 5

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!

APPENDIX B

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION LETTER

April 12, 1996

Dr. Linda B. Shonesy
1612 Drake Avenue
Huntsville, Al 35802

Dear Dr. Shonesy:

I am a doctoral candidate at Clark Atlanta University and enrolled in the Department of Educational Leadership. My proposed dissertation title is: A Comparative Study of the Attitudes of Public School Administrators and Faculty Toward Sexual Harassment.

My research lead me to your dissertation, *Perceptions of Administrators and Faculty Concerning sexual Harassment In Two-Year Institutions In Alabama (1993).* The instrument that you used would be a suitable instrument for me to obtain the necessary data for my research. I would not need to use questions five and six. Therefore, I am requesting permission to use this instrument with minor modifications.

The immediate response that you give to my request will be appreciated. Please address your correspondence to:

Gregory S. Nash
1370 East Washington Avenue
East Point, Georgia 30344

If you need to telephone me, please call collect 404-768-1370.

Sincerely,

Gregory S. Nash

XCOPY: Dr. John Blackshear, Advisor

APPENDIX C

DEMOGRAPHICAL TABLES

Table 1 indicates the number responding to the survey by gender. Of the 470 surveys distributed, responses were received from 37 males (7.87%) and 195 females (41.489%). The highest total percentage rate of return based upon 232 participants was female at 84.051% (195), with the male rate of return shown at 15.948% (37).

Table 1

Number of Responses by Gender

Gender	n	%
Male	37	15.948
Female	195	84.051
Total	232	99.999

Table 2 indicates the number of participants responding to the survey by race. Of the 232 surveys returned, responses were received from 161 blacks (69.396%), 69 whites (29.741%), 1 hispanic (0.431) and there was one missing response.

Table 2

Number of Responses by Race

Race	n	%
Black	161	69.396
White	69	29.741
Hispanic	1	0.431
Other	0	0.000
Missing Response	1	0.431
Total	232	99.999

Table 3 indicates the number of participants responding to the survey by martial status. Of the 232 surveys returned, responses were received from 126 married (54.310%), 9 widowed(3.879 %), 33 divorced (14.224 %), 3 separated (1.293 %), 60 single (25.862 %) and there was one missing response.

Table 3

Number of Responses by Marital Status

Marital Status	n	%
Married	126	54.310
Widowed	9	3.879
Divorced	33	14.224
Single	60	25.862
Separated	3	1.293
Missing Response	1	0.431
Total	232	99.999

Data generated according to the age of the participant are summarized in Table 4 for the total number of surveys returned. The highest percentage of respondents was 34.913 % (81) with ages between 41 and 50 years. The lowest response rate was 15.086 % (35) from those over 50.

Table 4

Number of Responses by Age

Age of Participant	Total n	%
Under 30	38	16.379
30 - 40	77	33.189
41 - 50	81	34.913
over 50	35	15.086
Missing Response	1	0.431
Total	232	99.998

Table 5 summarizes the data generated for the total sample according to the years of service at the present position. The highest percentage of response was from 86 participants (37.068%), who indicated between 3 and 10 years of service. The lowest percentage response was 15.517% (36) from participants with 0 to 2 years of service. Fifty-eight participants (25.000%) had 11 to 20 years of service, while those with over 20 years of service numbered 51 (21.982%).

Table 5

Number of Respondents by Years of Service

Years of Service	Total	
	n	%
0 - 2 years	36	15.517
3 - 10 years	86	37.068
11 - 20 years	58	25.000
over 20 years	51	21.982
missing variable	1	0.431
Total	232	99.998

Table 6 indicates the number of participants responding to the survey by number of years experience in present position. Of the 232 surveys returned, responses were received from 36 (15.517 %) participants with 0-2 years experience, 86 (37.068 %) with 3-10 years experience, 58 (25.000 %) with 11-20 years experience, 51 (22.982 %) with over 20 years experience and there was one missing response.

Table 6

Number of years in present position

Experience	n	%
0-2 years	36	15.417
3-10 years	86	37.068
11-20 years	58	25.000
Over 20 years	51	21.982
Missing Response	1	0.431
Total	232	99.898

Summary of Survey Responses

Items 8 through 17 of the survey instrument were designed to ascertain the survey participants' perceptions of the behaviors that could be defined as sexual harassment (See Appendix A). The responses to these items are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Responses Pertaining to Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Behaviors							
Item No.	Responses	SA n %	A n %	NO n %	D n %	SD* n %	Missing n %
8.	Sexist Comments	59	97	27	36	7	6
		25.43	41.81	11.63	15.51	3.01	2.58
9.	Undue Attention	22	68	42	81	14	5
		9.48	29.31	18.10	34.91	6.03	2.15
10.	Verbal Sexual	61	84	23	53	5	6
	Comments	26.29	36.20	9.91	22.84	2.15	2.58
11.	Body Language	53	97	35	35	8	4
		22.84	41.81	15.08	15.08	3.44	1.72
12.	Physical Advances	109	81	19	14	6	3
		46.98	34.91	8.18	6.03	2.58	1.29
13.	Explicit Sexual	113	72	15	19	7	6
	Propositions	48.70	31.03	6.46	8.18	3.01	2.58
14.	Sexual Assault	171	43	3	6	8	1
		73.70	18.53	1.29	2.58	3.44	.431
15.	Sexual Bribery	177	38	1	5	9	2
		76.29	16.37	.431	2.15	3.87	.862
16.	Submission to	178	34	5	7	8	0
		76.72	14.65	2.15	3.01	3.44	.00
17.	Hostile	176	37	5	4	6	4
	Environment	75.86	15.94	2.15	1.72	2.58	1.72

*SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; NO=No Opinion; D=Disagree; and SD=Strongly Disagree.

Summary of responses by position to Sexual Harassment Behaviors (Items 8 - 17) are found in Table 8.

Table 8

Summary of Sexual Harassment Responses by Position

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Interpretation
Administrators	23	1.5522	Agree
Faculty	193	1.9902	Agree

Items 18 through 23 of the survey instrument concerned experiences that the survey respondent may have perceived to have been sexual harassment (See Appendix A). The responses to these items are found in Table 9.

Table 9

Responses Pertaining to Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Experiences

Item No.		SA n %	A n %	NO n %	D n %	SD* n %	Missing n %
18.	Experienced behavior	34	52	26	63	49	8
	listed in 8 - 17?	14.65	22.41	11.20	27.15	21.12	3.44
19.	Was experience	41	45	48	36	31	31
	sexual harassment?	17.67	19.39	20.68	15.51	13.36	13.36
20.	Females experience	76	89	29	24	8	6
	s.h. more often than males?	32.75	38.36	12.50	10.34	3.44	2.58
21.	S. h. policy deters	37	97	55	26	11	6
	potential problems?	15.94	41.81	23.70	11.20	4.74	2.58
22.	Knowledge of law	34	116	37	29	12	4
	deters s.h.	14.65	50.00	15.94	12.50	5.17	1.72
23.	S. h. policy	15	78	79	33	18	9
	affected climate	6.46	33.62	34.05	14.22	7.75	3.87

*SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; NO=No Opinion; D=Disagree; and SD=Strongly Disagree.

Summary of responses by Position to Sexual Harassment Experiences (Items 18 - 23) are found in Table 10.

Table 10

Summary of Sexual Harassment Experiences Responses by Position			
Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Interpretation
Administrators	22	2.5833	No Opinion
Faculty	180	2.6685	No Opinion

Items 24 through 34 in the survey instrument concerned perceptions of attitudes that the participant has about sexual harassment (See Appendix A). The survey responses to these items are found in Table 11.

Table 11

Responses Pertaining to Perceptions of Sexual Harassment Attitudes

Item No.	Item	SA	A	NO	D	SD*	Missing
		n	n	n	n	n	n
		%	%	%	%	%	%
24.	S. h. is serious problem	10	37	97	68	13	7
	in district.	4.31	15.94	41.81	29.31	5.60	3.01
25.	S. h. is personal; the district	5	7	17	55	139	9
	should not become involved.	2.15	3.01	7.32	23.70	59.91	3.87
26.	S. h. should be reported to	127	78	8	6	7	3
	persons in authority.	54.74	33.62	3.44	2.58	3.01	1.29
27.	Victims should ignore s. h.	16	5	8	53	146	4
		6.89	2.15	3.44	22.84	62.93	1.72
28.	Victims usually encourage	5	5	17	78	119	8
	s. h.	2.15	2.15	7.32	33.62	51.29	3.44
29.	Most s. h. charges are valid.	16	85	99	23	3	6
		6.89	36.63	42.67	9.91	1.29	2.58
30.	Sexual harassers are usually	22	123	49	26	4	8
	aware that they are offending.	9.48	53.01	21.12	11.20	1.72	3.44
31.	S. h. can effect the victims'	53	128	31	9	2	9
	attendance.	22.84	55.17	13.36	3.87	.862	3.87
32.	S. h. has adverse effect on	51	107	46	9	6	13
	school climate.	21.98	46.12	19.82	3.87	2.58	5.60
33.	S. h. has adverse effect on	55	120	29	8	5	15
	work attitudes.	23.70	51.72	12.50	3.44	2.15	6.45
34.	The s. h. policy in district	24	104	63	18	9	14
	is adequate.	10.34	44.82	27.15	7.75	3.87	6.03

*SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; NO=No Opinion; D=Disagree; and SD=Stongly Disagree.

Responses by Position to Sexual Harassment Attitudes (Items 24 - 34) are found in Table 12.

Table 12

Summary of Sexual Harassment Attitudes Responses by Position

Variable	Number of Cases	Mean	Interpretation
Administrators	23	2.8735	No Opinion
Faculty	186	2.8803	No Opinion

References

AAUW. (1993). Hostile hallways: AAUW survey on sexual harassment in America's schools. Washington. DC: AAUW Education Foundation.

Adams, J. W., Kottke, J. L., & Padgitt, J. S. (1983). Sexual harassment of University students. *Journal of College Student Personnel, 23*(6), 484-490.

Adams, Sara & Johnston, Joni. (1992, January). Presentation at a public and professional forum on sexual harassment. Sponsored by the Mental Health Association, Fort Worth, Texas.

Adler, Jerry and Rosenberg, Diane. (1992). Must boys always be boys? *Newsweek, 120*(16), 77.

Ary, D., Jacobs, L., & Razavich, A. (1985). *Introduction to research in education.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Baker, D. D., Tepstra, D. E., & Cutler, B. D. (1990). Perceptions of sexual harassment: A re-examination of gender differences. *Journal of Psychology, 124,* 409-416.

Baker, D. D., Terpstra, D. E., & Larntz, K. (1990). The influence of individual characteristics and severity of harassing behavior or reactions to sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 22,* 305-325.

Benezet, L. T. (1981). Governance. In A. W. Chickering and Associates, *The Modern American College,* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 706-720.

Bittner, Marie. (1996). Sexual Harassment of Students: What's Happening in the Courts? *Middle School Journal, 7*(3).

Blum, Debra E. (October 9, 1991). Environment still hostile to women in academia, new evidence indicates. *The Chronicle of Higher Education, 37*(7).

Bogart, Karen and Stein, N. (1987). Breaking the Silence: Sexual Harassment in Education. *Peabody Journal of Education, 64* (4), 146-163.

Borg, Walter and Gall, M. D. (1989). *Educational research, an introduction.* 5th edition. New York: Longman.

Brandenburg, J. B. (1982). Sexual harassment in the university: Guidelines for establishing a grievance procedure. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*(2), 320-336

Bursik, K. (1992). Perceptions of sexual harassment in an academic context. *Sex Roles, 27*(7/8), 401-412.

Clay, Gordon (1993). *The National Men's Resource Calendar, 9*(1).

Coles, G. S. (1986). Forced to quit Sexual harassment complaint and agency response. *Sex Roles,* 81-85.

Corbett, K., Gentry, C., & Pearson, W. (1993). Sexual harassment in high school. *Youth and Society 25*(1), 93-103.

Court Dismisses Student Suit Alleging Counselor In Action. (1995, May). *Education USA.* 37(19), 5.

Crawford, M. & Gressley, D. (1991). Creativity, Caring, and context. Women's and Men's Accounts of Humor Preferences and Practices. *Psychology of Women's Quarterly. 15,* 217-231.

Doyle, J. (1985). Culture influences gender roles. *Male/Female Roles: Opposing Viewpoints,* edited by N. Bernards and T. O'Neill. Greenhaven Press, Inc.

EEOC guidelines on discrimination because of sex. (1980). 29 CFR Chapter XIV, Section 1604.11.

Ellis, S., Barad, A., & Pinto, A. (1991) Moderating effects of personal cognitiones on experienced and perceived sexual harassment of women at the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 21,* 1320-1337.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1990, March 19). *EEOC policy guidelines on current issues of sexual harassment* EEOC Notice Number N-915-050). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. (1980). Title VII Guidelines on Sexual Harassment. Washington, DC.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 189-191.

Farley, L. (1978). *Sexual shakedown: The sexual harassment of women on the job.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Fitzgerald, L. G. (1993). The last great open secret: The sexual harassment of women in the workplace and in academia (Seminar transcript). Washington, DC: Federation of Behavioral, Psychological and cognitive Sciences.

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Hesson-McInnis, M. (1989). The dimensions of sexual harassment: A structural analysis. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 35,* 3090-326.

Fitzgerald, L. F. & Ormerod, A. J. (1991). Perceptions of sexual harassment: The influence of gender and academic context. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 15,* 281-294.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Schulman, S. L. (1993). Sexual harassment. A research analysis and agenda for the 1990s. *Journal of Vocational Education. 42,* 152-175.

Fitzgerald, L. F., Schulman, S. L., Bailey, N. & Richards, M., Swecker, J., Gold, Y., Ormerod, M. & Weitzman, L. (1988). The incidence and dimensions of sexual harassment in academia and the workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 32,* 152-175.

Fossey, R. (1994). Law, trauma, and sexual abuse in the schools: Why can't children protect themselves? *West's Education Law Quarterly,* 3(4), 579-590.

Grauerholz, Elizabeth. (1989). Sexual Harassment of women professors by students: Exploring the dynamics of power, authority, and gender in a university setting. *Sex Roles 21* (11/12), 789-801

Gruber, J. E. (1992). A typology of personal and environmental sexual harassment: Research and policy implications for the 1990's. *Sex Roles, 26,* 447-464.

Gutek, B. (1985). *Sex and the workplace.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Gutek, B. A., Cohen, A. G. and Konrad, A. M. (1990). Predicting social-sexual behavior at work: a contact hypothesis. *Academy of Management Journal, 33*(3). 560-577.

Gutek, B. A. and Dunwoody, B. (1986). Understanding sex in the workplace, in Stomberg, A. H., Larwood, L. and Gutek, B. A. (Eds), *Women and the Work: An Annual review, 2,* 599-605.

Gutek, B. A. & Koss, M. P. (1993). Changed women and changed organizations: Consequences of and coping with sexual harassment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 28-48.

Hazzard, Terry. (1989). *Sexual Harassment: What's Good for the Goose Is Good for the Gander.* Florida State University, Department of Educational Leadership.

Hickerson, J., & Johnson, A (1992). Administrative perspectives on sexual harassment in the educational setting. In D. W. Wishnietsky (Ed.), *Sexual harassment in the educational environment* (pp. 205-213). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.

Hoffmann, Frances L. (1986). Sexual Harassment in Academia: Feminist Theory and Institutional Practice." *Harvard Educational Review, 56*(2), 105-121.

Hostile hallways: The AAUW survey on sexual harassment in America's schools (1993). Washington, DC: Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

Howard, Sharon. (1991). Organizational resources for addressing sexual harassment. *Journal of Counseling and Development 69*(6), 507-511.

Jaschik, M. L., & Fretz, B. R. (1991). Women's perceptions and labeling of sexual harassment. *Sex Roles, 25,* 19-23.

Jones, T. S., Remland, M. S., & Brunner, C. C. (1987). Effects of employment relationship, response of recipient and sex of rater on perceptions of sexual harassment. *Perceptual & Motor Skills,* 65, 55-63.

Jones, T., Remland, M. (1992). Sources of variability in perceptions of and responses to sexual harassment. *Sex-Roles 27*(3-4), 121-142.

Kenig, S., & Ryan, J. (1986). Sex differences in levels of tolerance and attribution of blame for sexual harassment on a university campus. *Sex Roles, 15*(9/10), 535-549.

Klein, Freda; Nancy Wilber; and Nan Stein. (1986). Section 4 - Legal Issues. *Who's Hurt and Who's Liable: Sexual Harassment in Massachusetts Schools. A Curriculum Guide for School Personnel.* Quincy, Mass.: Commonwealth of Massachusetts, 17-22.

Konrad, A. M., Gutek, B. A. (1986). Impact of work experiences on attitudes toward sexual harassment. *Administrative Science Quarterly 31,* 422-438.

Kutner, L. (1993, October 28). Bullying: A test of the limits of one's power and control. *New York Times,* C12.

Lach, D. H. & Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A. (1993). Sociological perspectives on sexual harassment and workplace dispute resolution. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 42,* 102-115

La Morte, M. (1987). *School law, cases and concepts.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

LeBlanc, A. (1992, September). Harassment in the halls. *Seventeen 170,* 162-165.

Lee, L. A. and Heppner, P. P. (1991). The development and evaluation of a sexual harassment inventory. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 69,* 512-517.

Lester, D., Banta, B., Barton,. J., & Elian, N. (1986). Judgments about sexual harassment: Effects of the power of the harasser. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 63,* 990.

Linn, Eleanor, Stein, N. D., and Young, Jackie. (1992). Bitter lessons for all sexual harassment in school. in James T. Sears, ed., *Sexuality and the Curriculum: The Politics and Practices of Sexuality Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Locy, T. (April 14, 1994). Dates, Families Driven to Court for Protection from Violent Youths. *The Boston Globe* 25, 33.

Loredo, C. Reid, A., & Deaux, K. (1995). Judgments and definitions of sexual harassment by high school students. *Sex-Roles 32*(1-2). 29-45.

Lott, B., Reilly, M., & Howard, D. (1982). Sexual assault and harassment: A campus community case study, *Signs: A Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8*(1), 296-319.

Malovich, N. J. & Stake, J. E. (1990). Sexual harassment on campus: Individual differences in attitudes and beliefs. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 14,* 63-79.

Marczel, B. (1993). A Legal Update on Sexual Harassment in the Public School. *Clearing House,* July/August.

Maroney, T. (January 21, 1995). Coming Unhinged Over Hand-Holding Ban. *The Boston Globe* 1, 9.

Martin Susan E. (1989). Sexual harassment: the link joining gender stratification, sexuality, and women's economic status. Rpt. in *Women,* edited by J. Freemen. Fourth edition. Mayfield.

Mazer, D. B. & Percival E. F. (1989). Students' experience of sexual harassment at a small university. *Sex Roles, 20,* 1-22.

McKinney, Kathleen. (1990). Sexual Harassment of University Faculty by Colleagues and Students. *Sex Roles,* 23(7/8),421-438.

Mickler, J. E., Chissom, B. S., & McLean, J. E. (1989). *A student guide for educational research,* 4th Ed. Tuscaloosa, Al: Capstone College of Education Society.

Montgomery County (Md.) Public Schools, No. 03931512. (December 13, 1993). Office for Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education, Philadelphia, Pa., Letter of Assurances.

Nashoba Regional School District, MA, No. 01-92-1327. (1993). Office for Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education, Boston, MA.

Norusis, Marija J. (1991). *Statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS/PC+).* Chicago, IL.: SPSS Incorporated..

Padgitt, S. C. & Padgitt, J. S. (1986). Cognitive structure of sexual harassment: Implications for university policy. *Journal of College Student Personnel. 27*(1), 34-39.

Peller, G. (July 25, 1993). Blackboard Jungle '93: Coping with Grouping and Worse. For Girls, High School Sometimes Feels like Tailhook. *The Washington Post,* C3.

Permanent Commission (CT) on the Status of women. (1995). In our own backyard: Sexual harassment in Connecticut's public high school. Hartford, CT: Author.

Reilly, M. E., Lott, B., and Gallogly, S. M. (1986). Sexual harassment of university students. *Sex Roles, 15,* 333-358.

Reutter, E. (1994). *The law of public education.* New York: Foundation Press.

Riger, Stephanie. (1991). Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment: polices and procedures. *American Psychologist. 46*(5), 497-505.

Roscoe, B., Strouse, J., Goodwin, M., Taracks, L., et al. (1994). Sexual harassment: An educational program for middle school students. *Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 29*(2), 110-120.

Roscoe, B., Strouse, J., Jeremiah, S., & Goodwin, M. (1994). Sexual harassment: Early adolescents' self-reports of experiences and acceptance. *Adolescence, 29*(115). 515-523.

Ross and Marlow. (1985). The Forbidden Apple. *The American School Board Journal 172,* 25-26,

Rowe, M. P. (1981). Dealing with Sexual Harassment. *Harvard Business Review 59,* 3: 426.

Rubin, Linda J. & Borgers, S. B. (1990). Sexual harassment in universities during the 1980's. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research, 23*(7/8), 397-411.

Ryan, J. & Denig, S. (1991). Risk and Ideology in Sexual Harassment. *Sociological Inquiry. 61*(2), 231-241.

Sandroff, R. (1992). Sexual harassment: The inside story. *Working Women, 17,* 47-51.

Schneider, B. E. (1987). Graduate women, sexual harassment, and university policy. *Journal of Higher Education, 58,* 46-65.

Scholzman, Kay L. (1991). Sexual harassment of students: what I learned in the library. *PS: Political Science & Politics, 24*(2), 236-239.

Sherrod, L. (January 20, 1993). Vance Studies Harassment Complaints. Alleged Assaults at Blair Draw Attention to Policy. *The Silver Spring (Md.) Record* 1,16.

Sherrod, L. (January 5, 1994). Blair sexual Harassment Investigation Closed. *The Burtonsville (Md.) Gazette* 1, 12.

Shonesy, Linda B. (1993). *Perceptions of administrators and faculty concerning sexual harassment in two-year institutions in Alabama.* An unpublished dissertation. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Sorenson, G. (1994). Peer sexual harassment: Remedies and guidelines under federal law. *West's Education Law Quarterly,* 3(4), 621-638.

Stein, N. (1993). It happens here too: sexual harassment and child sexual abuse in elementary and secondary schools. In S. K. Biklen & D. Pllard (eds.), *Gender and education. Ninety-Second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 5-11). Chicago, IL: Wellesley Center for Research on Woman.

Stein, N. (1995). Sexual harassment in school: The public performance of gendered violence. *Harvard - Educational - Review 65*(2), 145-162.

Stein, N., Marshall, N. L., & Tropp, L. R. (1993). *Secrets in public: Sexual harassment in our schools.* Wellesley, MA: Center for Research on Women.

Stein, N. (1996). Slippery Justice. *Educational Leadership 53*(8), 64-68.

Stringer, Donna M., Remick, H., Salisbury, J., & Ginorio, A. B. (1990). The Power and Reasons Behind Sexual Harassment: An Employer's Guide to Solutions. *Public Personnel Management, 19*(1), 43-52.

Sullivan, K. (January 15, 1993). Harassment Complaints Grip School Officials at Blair High Face Student Protest, Threat of 2nd Lawsuit. *The Washington Post.* D1,6.

Tata, Jasmine. (1993). The structure and phenomenon of sexual harassment: Impact of category of sexually harassing behavior, gender, and hierarchical level. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology 23*(3), 199-211.

Terpstra, D. E. & Baker, D. D. (1986). Psychological and demographics correlates of perception of sexual harassment. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 112.* 459-478.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1987). A hierarchy of sexual harassment. *The Journal of Psychology, 121,* 599-605.

Terpstra, D. E., & Baker, D. D. (1989). The identification and classification of reactions to sexual harassment. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 10*(1). 1-14.

Till, G. J. (1980). *Sexual harassment: A report on the sexual harassment of students.* Washington, DC: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Programs.

Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Equal Employment Act of 1972. 42 U.S.C. Section 2000e to 2000e-17 (1976).

Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972. (1980). 20 U.S.C. Section 1681, Part 106. *Federal Register, 45*(92).

Underwood, Julie. (1987). End Sexual Harassment of Employees, Or Your Board Could Be Held Liable. *American School Board Journal, 174*(4), 43-44.

Webb, S. L. (1991). *Step forward: Sexual harassment in the workplace.* New York: Mastermedia.

Wetherfield, Alison. (1990). Sexual Harassment: The Current State of the Law Governing Educational Institutions." *Initiatives, 52*(4), 23-27.

Williams, E. A., Lam, J. A., & Shively, M. (1992). The impact on a university policy on the sexual harassment of female students. *Journal of Higher Education, 63*(1), 50-63.

Wishnietsky, D. H. (1991). Reported and unreported teacher - student sexual harassment. *Journal of Educational Research, 84*(3), 164-169.

Yaffe, E. (1995). Expensive, illegal and wrong: sexual harassment in our schools. *Phi Delta Kappan 77*(3). 1-15.

Court Cases

Alexander v. Yale University. (2nd Cir. 1980) 631 F. 2nd 178.

De Shaney v. Winnebago County Department of Social Services. (1989). 489 U. S. 189.

Doe v. Petaluma City School District. (1993). 489 U. S. 189.

D. R. v. Middle Bucks Area Vocational Technical School (1992). 972 F. 2d 1364.

Franklin v. Gwinnett County Public Schools. (1992). 112 S.Ct. 1028, 117 L. Ed. 2d 208.

Ingraham v. Wright. (1977). 430 U. S. 651, 674.

Jane Doe v. Taylor Independent School District. (1992). 975 F. 2d 137.

Menitor Savings Bank, FSB v. Vinson. (1986). 106 S.Ct. 2399.

Stoneking v. Bradford Area School District (1988). 882 F. 2d 720, 725.

20 United States Code, Section 1681.

42 United States Code, Section 1983.

114-2
D-280
193